

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association.  
 For the present, THE QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October;  
 the times of publication of THE REVIEW are variable under prevailing conditions

# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

G. T. GRIFFITH, M.A., Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge  
 D. L. PAGE, M.A., Christ Church, Oxford

## BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Prof. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. (*Acting Chairman and Hon. Treas.*)  
 Prof. R. G. AUSTIN, M.A. W. S. WATT, M.A.  
 Prof. F. W. WALBANK, M.A. F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (*Hon. Sec.*)

*Representing the Council of  
the Classical Association.*

N. G. L. HAMMOND, M.A., *representing the Cambridge Philological Society*

*With the co-operation of Prof. B. D. MERITT, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton; Prof. J. A. FITZHERBERT,  
University of Adelaide; and Prof. HOMER A. THOMPSON, University of Toronto*

Volume XLIII

JULY—OCTOBER 1949

Numbers 3, 4

## CONTENTS

THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF PLUTARCH MORALIA 70-7. G. R. MANTON . . . . .	97
GREEK RECORD-KEEPING AND RECORD-BREAKING. M. N. TOD . . . . .	105
'ΑΛΦΙΤΑ—A NOTE. L. A. MORITZ . . . . .	113
INTERPRETATIONES PROPERTIANAE. W. R. SMYTH . . . . .	118
THE TEXT OF THE PHAEDO IN W AND IN HENRICUS ARISTIPPUS' TRANSLATION. H. KLOS and L. MINIO-PALUELLO . . . . .	126
NOTES ON ORIENTIUS' COMMONITORIUM I. A. HUDSON-WILLIAMS . . . . .	130
NOTES ON DELPHIC ORACLES. H. W. PARKE and D. E. W. WORMELL . . . . .	138
VIRGIL, CATALEPTON 5. 1-2. L. P. WILKINSON . . . . .	140
ARISTOTLE'S THEORY OF THE FORMATION OF METALS AND MINERALS. D. E. EICHHOLZ . . . . .	141

OXFORD: AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE : OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Price for single numbers, 5s. 6d. net (5s. 8d. post free); for double numbers, 11s. net (11s. 4d. post free). Yearly subscription, 18s. post free; U.S.A., \$3.85. Combined yearly subscription for THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and THE CLASSICAL REVIEW, 30s. post free; U.S.A., \$6.30

TH

(  
C

PARIS  
instig  
eight  
Planu  
*Πλου*  
and c  
treati  
one c  
beyon

TI  
manu  
E and  
of lac  
F

<sup>1</sup> I  
Profes  
for va  
J. E.  
publis

<sup>2</sup> E  
cerpt  
*Überli*  
pp. 5-  
*vitae* a  
third,  
and A

<sup>3</sup> F  
M. Po  
(1925),  
there  
nudes  
and J  
Plutar

*Univ.*

*ture*, v  
<sup>4</sup> E  
cause

cf. Po

<sup>5</sup> Cl

pp. xi

<sup>6</sup> B

*moralis*

49, 50,

<sup>7</sup> N

also f



# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JULY—OCTOBER 1949

## THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF PLUTARCH

### MORALIA 70-7<sup>1</sup>

(70 *amatorius*; 71 *de facie in orbe lunae*; 72 *de Pythiae oraculis*; 73 *adversus Coloten*; 74 *de communibus notitiis*; 75 *de genio Socratis*; 76 *de malignitate Herodoti*; 77 *de animae procreatione in Timaeo*.)

PARISINUS 1672<sup>2</sup> (E in Wytttenbach and all subsequent editions), executed at the instigation of Maximus Planudes,<sup>3</sup> is the only manuscript which contains all seventy-eight extant *moralia* of Plutarch. It may be dated soon after 1302, the year in which Planudes appended to his manuscript of the Greek Anthology (Marc. 481) a *πίναξ Πλουτάρχου* containing the titles of the first sixty-nine<sup>4</sup> of the seventy-eight treatises and concluding with the words *ταῦτα πάντα εὑρέθη*. The addition of nine further treatises to the *Corpus* was made possible by the discovery of two further sources, one containing Nos. 70-7 and the other No. 78. The tradition of No. 78 is established beyond doubt:<sup>5</sup> we are concerned here only with the remaining eight, Nos. 70-7.

These eight treatises appear again in the same order in the fifteenth-century manuscript Parisinus 1675 (B)<sup>6</sup> and, except for No. 77,<sup>7</sup> in no other manuscript. That E and B in these treatises are closely related is clear from the existence of a number of lacunae<sup>8</sup> common to both.

For establishing the relationship between E and B there is, in addition to the

<sup>1</sup> I have to thank Professor D. S. Robertson, Professor F. E. Adcock, and Mr. F. H. Sandbach for various corrections and suggestions, and Mr. J. E. Powell for permission to include his unpublished emendations.

<sup>2</sup> E contains: *πίναξ, vitae, moralia* 1-78, excerpt from Appian. M. Treu (*Zur Geschichte der Überlieferung von Plutarchs moralia* i (1877), pp. 5-6) rightly distinguishes five hands: first, *vitae* and *moralia* 1-57; second, *moralia* 58-76; third, *moralia* 77; fourth, *moralia* 78; fifth, *πίναξ* and Appian.

<sup>3</sup> For the history of the *Corpus Planudeum* see M. Pohlenz in *Plutarchi moralia*, ed. Teubner. (1925), vol. i, Praefatio, pp. ix ff., and the works there cited, especially M. Wegehaupt, 'Planudes und Plutarch', *Philol.* lxxiii. 244-52 (1914) and J. B. Titchener, 'The MS. Tradition of Plutarch's *Aetia Graeca* and *Aetia Romana*', *Univ. of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, vol. ix, no. 2 (1924).

<sup>4</sup> Except for No. 38, which was omitted because it was not yet complete: see below, and cf. Pohlenz, op. cit., p. xxi, n. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. C. Hubert, ed. Teubner, vol. iv (1938), pp. xiv ff.

<sup>6</sup> B contains (all in one hand): *vitae* xviii; *moralia* 31, 68, 69, 66, 30, 64, 67, 55, 46, 47, 41-4, 49, 50, 53, 56, 22, 23, 52, 65, 58, 34, 70-7, 38, 40, 4, 5.

<sup>7</sup> No. 77 (*de animae procreatione in Timaeo*) is also found in one other MS. containing other

*moralia*, Urbinas 99 (s. xv); in five miscellaneous MSS., Marcianus 523 (s. xv), Laurentianus plut. 70 cod. 5 (s. xv), Oxoniensis (Coll. Corp. Chr. 99) (s. xv), Scorialensis 72 (s. xv/xvi), Parisinus 1042 (s. xvi); and in two 15th-century MSS. of Plato, in which Plutarch's treatise is appended to the *Timaeus*, Marciani 184 and 187. Certain of these MSS. were used by Wytttenbach and by Müller (*Über die Seelenschöpfung im Timaeus*, 1878), but no reliable collation has been published. As far as I can judge from such readings as are recorded in those editions, there is no reason for suspecting any tradition independent of EB.

<sup>8</sup> Some of the lacunae are due to the inability of a scribe to recognize a word: e.g. *ἀπο* followed by a lacuna of five letters occurs three times (in 872F bis and 873D) in E where the true reading is *ἀνεορώ* or *ἀνεοροῖ*. In two of these instances B has the same as E: in the third the restoration *ἀπόλεψεν* (cf. below, p. 103). Material damage could hardly be responsible for obliterating the second part of the same word on each of three occasions. Paton (*Pythici dialogi tres* (1893), p. xxii) attributes the lacunae found in E in No. 69 (*de defectu oraculorum*) to the inability of a scribe to make sense of corrupt passages, and suspects that the same cause underlies the lacunae in EB in 70-7. (Cf. also Titchener, op. cit., pp. 55-9 and 63.) I hope in a later article to publish a systematic investigation into all these lacunae.

evidence to be derived from a collation of E and B, certain external evidence relating to the contents of the source of these treatises in E.

That the source of Nos. 70-7 in E may also have contained No. 38 was first suggested by Treu.<sup>1</sup> For in the Planudean manuscripts earlier than E and in their descendants<sup>2</sup> the beginning of No. 38 (*quaestiones Platonicae*) is missing, two folia being left blank and the following note inserted where the text begins: Πλατωνικά ζητήματα ὧν οὐχ εὐρέθη ἡ ἀρχή. The same course was originally followed in E, where, however, we find that the note has later been erased and the missing part of the text inserted on the blank folia. A new source for No. 38 must therefore have come to hand after the main part of the treatise had been copied, and that new source may also have been the source for Nos. 70-7.

Treu's suggestion is corroborated by a reference in another manuscript to a source which contained at least four out of the group 70-7 together with No. 38. On folio 1 (verso) of the earlier (11th-century) part of Marc. 250 (X) the writer<sup>3</sup> gives a list of the twenty-nine *moralia* included in that part of the manuscript and continues in these words:

ἔως ὧδε ὁ πίναξ τῶν λόγων τοῦ παρόντος βιβλίου. λείπουν δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἠθικῶν ἕτεροι δέκα λόγοι, ὧν αἱ ἐπιγραφαὶ εἰσιν αἰδεῖ· πλουτάρχου ἐρωτικός, περὶ τοῦ ἐμφαινομένου κύκλου τῆς σελήνης, περὶ τῆς ἐν τιμαίῳ ψυχογονίας, πλατωνικά ζητήματα, περὶ τοῦ μὴ χρᾶν ἔμμετρα νῦν τὴν πυθίαν.

We have here the titles of the first five of a group of ten *moralia*. They are Nos. 70, 71, 77, 38, and 72, in that order. Müller<sup>4</sup> had already seen in this entry a reference to the source of Nos. 70-7 in EB. Wegehaupt<sup>5</sup> realized its significance in confirming the suggestion of Treu that the manuscript which was the source of Nos. 70-7 in E also contained No. 38. No. 38 would naturally have been passed over at this point by the scribe of E as it had already been transcribed in its normal position earlier in the *Corpus*.<sup>6</sup> The only difficulty remaining, as far as E was concerned, was to explain why the scribe, with this source in front of him, should also have passed over at this point No. 77. The answer is given by F. H. Sandbach,<sup>7</sup> who suggests that No. 77 was passed over because there was already included in the *Corpus*, as No. 42, one long excerpt, wrongly called an epitome, from this very work. When No. 77 was eventually added to E it was transcribed by another hand.

Thus the difference in the order of these treatises between E and the entry in X is easily accounted for by the preceding contents of E itself. But the same cannot be said of B. For the scribe of B, if he came upon No. 38 between Nos. 71 and 72, had no reason for passing it over, as he had not previously transcribed it:<sup>8</sup> nor is it conceivable that when he came to No. 77, although like E he had already transcribed No. 42, its so-called epitome, he would have combined in his own person the action taken by two successive scribes of E, first passing over No. 77 at the point where he came upon it in his exemplar and later changing his mind and adding it after No. 76.

We are therefore left with two alternatives. Either B is derived from E, and has followed the order of E in these treatises; or B is independent of E and they have derived the order of treatises 70-7 from their archetype. This second alternative

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit., p. xi.

<sup>2</sup> See Pohlenz, op. cit., pp. xxviii and xxix.

<sup>3</sup> Treu (op. cit. i, p. xiii) places this entry in the fifteenth century. But it cannot be later than the fourteenth, since it does not include the contents of the fourteenth-century part of the MS., which are added immediately below in a later hand (now almost illegible) prefixed by the

word ἐνεγράφησαν.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit., p. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit., p. 396.

<sup>6</sup> See p. 97, n. 2, above.

<sup>7</sup> 'Some Textual Notes on Plutarch's *Moralia*', C.Q. xxxv (1941), pp. 110 ff.

<sup>8</sup> For contents of B see p. 97, n. 6, above.

involves two unlikely hypotheses: first, that there were in existence two MSS., one the source of the entry in X and the other the archetype of EB, each containing certain works unrepresented in any other known MS. (apart from E and B), and containing them in a different order; second, that it is only a coincidence that the divergence in order between E and the entry in X can be explained from the previous contents of E.

The external evidence is therefore strongly in favour of the derivation of B from E. I now wish to show that the internal evidence supports this view, that is to say, that there are no readings peculiar to B which cannot be explained as due either to accidental error or to conjectural emendation.

There are in these eight treatises about 160<sup>1</sup> passages in which B has either the truth or what has been accepted by editors as the truth where E has either a lacuna or an error. In the majority of these passages the emendation involved in the reading of B is too slight and obvious to need comment. Sometimes, in addition to the new reading, the reading of E is given either above the line or in the margin (prefixed by *γράφεται*): sometimes the new reading is itself so added and the reading followed in the first place is that of E. All these corrections appear to have been made by the first hand. There will therefore have been, if my thesis is correct, between E and B an intermediate manuscript in which corrections were made both on the basis of conjecture and on the basis of revision from E.

There are, however, among these 160 passages 13 in which B has readings which at first sight appear to be due to an independent source, but which on closer examination are more probably either false conjectures or conjectures which, while sometimes true and usually plausible, were well within the capability of a Byzantine scholar of the period.<sup>2</sup> These passages are as follows:<sup>3</sup>

395A *de Pythiae oraculis* 1

οὐ μὴν ταῦτα μάλιστα θαυμάζειν ἄξιον, ἀλλὰ πραότης τε πολλὴν χάριν ἔχουσα, καὶ τὸ μάχιμον καὶ διαπορητικὸν ὑπὸ συνέσεως, οὔτε δύσκολον οὔτ' ἀντίτυπον πρὸς τὰς ἀποκρίσεις· ὥστε καὶ βραχὺ συγγενόμενον εὐθὺς εἰπεῖν <τέκος ἀγαθοῦ> πατρός. ὁλοθα γὰρ Διογενιανὸν ἀνδρῶν ἀριστον.

For *τέκος ἀγαθοῦ* in B there is a lacuna of 9 letters in E.

It is clear from the reply to this speech that the Diogenianus in the last line is the

<sup>1</sup> I have disregarded all minor differences of accent, breathing, and division of words. The results here given are based on my own collation from photostats of Nos. 76 and 77 and, for Nos. 70-5, on the published collation of Treu (op. cit. ii (Ohlau, 1881) supplemented and corrected by Bernardakis (vol. i, pp. 1-11), Sieveking (cf. Teubner ed. 2, vol. iii, p. xxviii), Flacelière (*Sur les oracles de la Pythie*, 1937), and Raingeard (*Le περί τοῦ προσώπου de Plutarque*, 1935). It is worth recording that of the 160 cases only 5 are from No. 77 (*de animae procreatione in Timaeo*), and it will be noted that none of the 13 special cases selected for treatment below is from this work. The scholar who found so many opportunities for emendation in the other treatises must here have been deterred by the technicalities of the subject-matter. There is of course a number of instances in No. 77 of differences due to error in B. It so happens that one of them provides positive evidence of the descent of B

from E: in 1029E *ὄντων* occurs at the end of a line in E, the ending *-ων* being written, as often, above the line. At the end of the line immediately above we have *φαίνεται* with the symbol for the final *-αι* reaching well below the line. The tail of this symbol has been mistaken for the symbol for *-ας* and added to *ὄντ-* in the line below to produce *ὄντας* for *ὄντων* in B.

<sup>2</sup> On the conjectural emendations of Byzantine scholars see P. Maas, 'Eustathios als Konjekturealkritiker', *B.Z.* xxxv (1935), pp. 299-307 and xxxvi (1936), pp. 27-31, and the observations of the same writer on emendations of the 'Socratic' letters and of certain works of Xenophon, attributable to Georgios Chrysokokkes in the first half of the 15th century (*B.Z.* xxviii (1928), p. 430 and xxxiii (1933), p. 167).

<sup>3</sup> The text in each passage, except where otherwise indicated, is that of E, with the supplements found in B included in brackets < >.



father of the young man (also, as appears later, a Diogenianus) whose character is under discussion. The supplement in B therefore corresponds to the sense required, but whereas the word τέκος is otherwise confined to poetry the phrase τέκος ἀγαθοῦ πατρός does not read like a quotation from any poet. Wilamowitz and Hubert recognize the passage as corrupt. Schwartz emends: τέκος ἀγαθὸν ἀγαθοῦ πατρός. Kronenberg (*Mnemosyne*, 3rd ser. vii, p. 39), arguing against the need for this addition, quotes Theophrastus, *Char.* 2 χρηστοῦ πατρός νεοττία and Ar. *Av.* 767 τοῦ πατρός νεοττίον; and νεοττίον τοῦ πατρός may be the true reading here. The author of the correction found in B will have supplied τέκος because he felt that a quotation from a poet was required. The only passage I can find which might have suggested τέκος in this context is the line addressed by Telemachus to Menelaus:

αἰματός εἰς ἀγαθοῖο, φίλον τέκος, οἷ' ἀγορεύεις. Hom. *Od.* 4. 611

402D *de Pythiae oraculis* 17

οὐκ ὀρθῶς οὖν Εὐδοξὸς ἐπίστευσε τοῖς Στυγὸς ὕδωρ τοῦτο καλεῖσθαι πεφύκασι.

So E. For πεφύκασι B has πεφύγασι, which is accepted without question by Sieveking and by Babbitt. The ἀποφύγασι of Turnebus, which is adopted by Wyttenbach and Paton and would suggest the independence of B, involves an objectionable hiatus. Other emendations suggested are: γε φήσασι or πεπεικόσι (Bernardakis), and πεποιηκόσι (Wilamowitz). None is entirely satisfactory, but there is no reason to suppose that the reading of B is any closer to the truth than that of E, of which it may well be an attempted emendation.

404B *de Pythiae oraculis* 20

ἔστι δ' οὐδέτερον, ὦ παῖ, παράλογον, μόνον ἂν <ὀρθάς> καὶ καθαρὰς περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ δόξας ἔχωμεν καὶ μὴ νομίζωμεν αὐτὸν ἐκείνον εἶναι τὸν τὰ ἔπη συντιθέντα πρότερον καὶ νῦν ὑποβάλλοντα τῇ Πυθίᾳ τοὺς χρησμούς, ὥσπερ ἐκ προσωπίων φβεγγόμενον.

For the lacuna in E of 9 letters B has ὀρθάς. This has been accepted by all editors but is not convincing. The best that can be said of it is that it is a not impossible restoration, and would have been an obvious one for a reviser to make. εὐσεβεῖς would come nearer to filling the lacuna.

Pohlenz deletes ἂν, comparing 721D μόνον, ἔφη, ἐνιστάσθω πρὸς τὰς πρώτας ὑποθέσεις. However, ἂν may well be all that has remained of a lost adjective such as ἀναμαρτήτους or ἀνυπόπτους (cf. ὑφεωρῶντο in a similar context in 407B).

585B *de genio Socratis* 15

οὔτε γὰρ ἐν ἡδοναῖς μεγάλας μὲν ἀτόποις δὲ καὶ βλαβεραῖς οἷόν τε τὴν διάνοιαν ἡρεμεῖν μὴ πολλάκις ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ ἀπολαύειν καταφρονήσασαν, οὔτε λήμματα μοχθηρὰ καὶ πλεονεξίας μεγάλας εἰς ἐφικτὸν ἡκούσας ὑπερβῆναι ῥάδιον ᾧτινι μὴ πόρρωθεν ἐνδεδωκεν καὶ κεκόλασται τὸ φιλοκερδές.

For ἐνδεδωκεν (l. 3) in E we find in B ἐνδέδοται, on the basis of which Schwartz conjectured δέδετα. But it is difficult to see why, if this was the true reading, it should have given rise to ἐνδεδωκεν in E, even if ἐνδέδοται in B is to be regarded as an intermediate stage of corruption.

On the other hand, the presence of the passive κεκόλασται might easily have given rise to the change from ἐνδεδωκεν to ἐνδέδοται.

598F *de genio Socratis* 34

ἐκπεπληγμένοι δὲ τὸν κίνδυνον ἄλλως προφασίζοντο Λυσανορίδαν· παραμένειν γὰρ (lac. 17 lilt.) ἢ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης. διὸ καὶ τοῦτον μὲν ὕστερον, ὡς πυνθανόμεθα, χρήμασι(ν) οὐκ

ὀλίγοις ἐζημίωσαν) τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων οἱ γέροντες, 'Ηριππίδαν' δὲ καὶ Ἀρκεσον ἀπέκτειναν εὐθὺς ἐν Κορίνθῳ λαβόντες.

In line 3 for χρήμασι followed by a lacuna of 19 letters in E we find in B χρήμασιν οὐκ ὀλίγοις ἐζημίωσαν, which has been accepted by editors as the true reading.

Plutarch is speaking of the Spartan garrison on the Cadmea which failed to suppress the revolt raised in the city below by the Theban exiles who returned at the end of 379 B.C. From 578A it is clear that Lysanoridas, the chief of the three harmosts, had left shortly before the coup for Haliartus, to make recompense for sacrilege committed on the tomb of Alcmena at the orders of Agesilaus. His absence provided the two subordinate harmosts in the moment of crisis with an excuse for making no attempt to quell the revolt, and the Spartan *gerousia* later on with good reason for letting him off with a fine. We may therefore accept Reiske's conjecture of *περιμένειν* for *παραμένειν* in line 1, to be followed and not preceded by a stop. (The expression *ἄλλως προφασίζοντο* with an infinitive is paralleled in 530D τοῦ μενικίου ἄλλως προφασίζομένου μαλακώτερον ἔχειν, where *ἄλλως* seems to mean, as here, 'idly'.) The words immediately following (γὰρ—ἐκεῖνης) must have stated the fact of Lysanoridas' absence, and we may provisionally accept J. E. Powell's restoration οὐ γὰρ παρῆν τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκεῖνης. In the next sentence the missing words in E are not likely to have been οὐκ ὀλίγοις ἐζημίωσαν, for the result of the absence of Lysanoridas was not that he suffered a heavy fine but that, while his junior colleagues were put to death, he suffered no more than a fine. χρήμασι μόνον ἐζημίωσαν would be a more likely restoration. The source of the restoration in B will have been the *Life of Pelopidas* (c. 13) οἱ δὲ Σπαρτιάται, τριῶν ἀρμοστῶν γενομένων ἐν Θήβαις, 'Ηριππίδαν' μὲν καὶ Ἀρκεσον ἀπέκτειναν κρίναντες, ὁ δὲ τρίτος Λυσανορίδας χρήμασι πολλοῖς ζημιωθείς αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς Πελοποννήσου μετέστησε. οὐκ ὀλίγοις was preferred to πολλοῖς because it came nearer to filling the lacuna in E.

758C *amatorius* 16

'ἐκεῖνο δ' ὁ πατὴρ 'οὐκ ἄτοπον' εἶπεν, 'εἰ τέσσαρα γένη τῆς φιλίας ἐχούσης, ὥσπερ οἱ παλαιοὶ διώρισαν, τὸ <φυσικὸν πρῶτον εἶτα τὸ> συγγενικὸν ἐπὶ τούτῳ καὶ τρίτον <τὸ> ἑταιρικὸν <καὶ τελευταῖον τὸ ἐρωτικόν>, ἔχει τούτων ἕκαστον ἐπιστάτην θεὸν ἢ φίλιον ἢ ξένιον ἢ ὁμόγιον καὶ πατρίων· μόνον δὲ ἐρωτικὸν ὥσπερ δυσιεροῦν [ἄνοσον]<sup>2</sup> καὶ ἀδέσποτον ἀφεῖται, καὶ ταῦτα πλείστης ἐπιμελείας καὶ κυβερνήσεως δεόμενον.'

E gives no indication of lacunae. The restoration found in B is not entirely satisfactory, as the fact that τούτων in line 3 is thereby made to refer only to the first three of the four γένη makes the passage obscure. J. E. Powell restores as follows:

... ὥσπερ οἱ παλαιοὶ διώρισαν, τὸ <ἐρωτικὸν πρῶτον, εἶτα τὸ> συγγενικὸν ἐπὶ τούτῳ, καὶ τρίτον <τὸ> ἑταιρικὸν <τελευταῖον δὲ τὸ πατρικόν, Δία μὲν> ἔχει τούτων ἕκαστον ἐπιστάτην θεὸν ἢ φίλιον ἢ ξένιον ἢ ὁμόγιον [καὶ πατρίων]· μόνον δὲ κτλ.

Whether or not this is what Plutarch wrote, the source of the restoration found in B is not far to seek. Diogenes Laertius, an author well known to Byzantine scholars (cf. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*, pp. 324, 464, 567), in discussing the tripartite division of *φιλία* in Plato, sums up (iii. 81): τῆς ἅρα φιλίας ἡ μὲν ἐστὶ φυσική, ἡ δὲ ἑταιρική, ἡ δὲ ξενική· προστιθέασι δὲ τινες τετάρτην ἐρωτικὴν.

<sup>1</sup> I have written 'Ηριππίδαν both in *mor.* 598F and in *vit. Pel.* 13 instead of the 'Ερμιππίδαν of the MSS., following a suggestion of Professor F. E. Adcock. In *mor.* 586E the MSS. have Κριππίδας. Herippidas was active in 399 (cf. Xen. *Hell.* iii.

4. 6, 26; iv. 1-8 *passim*). The name Hermippidas is otherwise unknown.

<sup>2</sup> For ἄνοσον Reiske conjectured ἀνόσιον, Wilamowitz ἄθεον. Possibly it was originally a gloss on δυσιεροῦν.

766D *amatorius* 20

τῆς δὲ Γοργοῦς Ἀσανδρός τις ἡράσθη, νέος ἐπιεικῆς καὶ γένει λαμπρός· ἐκ δὲ λαμπρῶν εἰς ταπεινὰ πράγματα καὶ <εὐτελῇ> ἀφигμένος, ὅμως αὐτὸν οὐδενὸς ἀπηξιοῦτο.

For a lacuna of 7-8 letters in E we find in B εὐτελῇ, which is objectionable on grounds of hiatus. Bernardakis suggested substituting εὐτέλειαν for εὐτελῇ or changing the order to ταπεινὰ καὶ εὐτελῇ πράγματα. But there is further corruption. ἀπηξιοῦτο with the reflexive αὐτὸν is unparalleled, and while ἐκ λαμπρῶν εἰς ταπεινὰ πράγματα ἀφигμένος indicates a change from wealth to poverty, γένει λαμπρός indicates only high birth, not wealth. It is possible that Plutarch wrote γένει λαμπρός καὶ πλούτῳ (cf. 749D) and that καὶ πλούτῳ being omitted and added in the margin came to be inserted after πράγματα. The word πλούτῳ being then unintelligible in that position would have been omitted by E or a predecessor. εὐτελῇ, apart from considerations of hiatus, was an obvious conjecture to make.

770D-E *amatorius* 25

τῷ δὲ Σαβίνῳ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πράγματα ῥαδίως παρείχεν ἐκποδὼν γενέσθαι καὶ καταφυγεῖν εἰς τοὺς βαρβάρους· <ἦν δὲ γυναῖκα> πασῶν ἀρίστην ἡγμένος, ἦν ἐκεῖ μὲν Ἑμπὸν ἑκάλουν, Ἑλληνιστὶ δ' ἂν τις Ἑρωίδα προσαγορεύσειεν· οὐτ' ἀπολιπεῖν δυνατὸς ἦν οὔτε μεθ' αὐτοῦ κομίζειν.

E's lacuna of 11 letters is again exactly filled by the additional words found in B, but the text, as restored, is not entirely satisfactory, and has been variously emended by Bernardakis and Wilamowitz (see Teubner edd. 1 and 2). However, B's remedy is a simple and obvious one. ἦν is needed to complete the sense of ἡγμένος, δέ to provide the contrast with τὰ μὲν ἄλλα, and γυναῖκα to supply a noun with πασῶν ἀρίστην.

867C *de malignitate Herodoti* 34

ὁ μὲν Πίνδαρος οὐκ ὦν συμμάχου πόλεως ἀλλὰ μηδίζεν αἰτίαν ἐχούσης, ὅμως τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου μνηστὴς ἐπιπεφώνηκεν

ὥς οἱ παῖδες Ἀθαναίων ἐβάλ[λ]οντο φαεινὰν  
κρητὶδ' ἐλευθερίας.

For ὥς οἱ B has the true reading ὄθι.

This fragment of Pindar is quoted by Plutarch in *vit. Them.* 8 (115F), in *de gloria Atheniensium* 7 (350A), and in *de sera numinis vindicta* 6 (552B). In 350A ὄθι is replaced by Plutarch's own words ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ. The manuscripts have ὄτι (corrected by Stephanus to ὄθι) in *vit. Them.* 8 and ὄθι in *de sera numinis vindicta*, which is contained in B later on and may have been the source of the correction in an intermediate manuscript between E and B.

873B *de malignitate Herodoti* 42

τοὺς δ' Ἑλλήνας ἀποδειλιάσαντας καὶ ἀποδρ[ασ]άντας οὐκ ἀπῆλυνον τῶν ἀριστείων ἀλλ' ἐνέγραφον τοῖς στρ.π.σι καὶ τοῖς κολοσσοῖς καὶ μετεδίδωσαν τῶν λαφύρων.

For στρ.π.σι in E we have τροπαίους in B. But Plutarch must here be referring to the colossal statues of Zeus and Poseidon dedicated at Olympia and the Isthmus at the same time and out of the same spoil as the golden tripod mounted on the serpent column at Delphi (Hdt. ix. 81. 1). The true reading must therefore be τρίποσι, and the restoration τροπαίους will probably have been due to the occurrence of περὶ τοῦ τροπαίου in the previous sentence.



873C *de malignitate Herodoti* 42

καὶ μὴν Πανσανίας, ὥς λέγουσιν, ἤδη τυραννικὰ φρονῶν ἐπέγραψεν ἐν Δελφοῖς  
 Ἑλλήνων ἀρχηγὸς ἐπεὶ στρατὸν ὤλεσε Μήδων  
 Πανσανίας, Φο(ί)βῳ μνήμ' ἀνέθηκε τόδε,

κοινούμενος ἀμωσγένεω<sup>1</sup> τοῖς Ἑλλήσι τὴν δόξαν ὧν ἑαυτὸν ἀνηγόρευσε ἡγεμόνα· τῶν δ' Ἑλλήνων οὐκ ἀνασχομένων ἀλλ' ἐγκαλούντων, πέμψαντες εἰς Δελφοὺς Λακεδαιμόνιοι τοῦτο μὲν ἐξεκόλαψαν, τὰ δ' ἐν ὀνόματι τῶν πόλεων, ὥσπερ ἦν δίκαιον, ἐνεχάραξαν. καίτοι πῶς εἰκὸς ἔστιν ἢ τοὺς Ἑλλήνας ἀγανακτεῖν τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς μὴ μετασχόντας, εἰ συνήδεσαν ἑαυτοῖς τὴν ἀπεστῶ<sup>2</sup> τῆς μάχης, ἢ Λακεδαιμόνιους τὸν ἡγεμόνα καὶ στρατηγὸν ἐκχαράξαντας, ἐπιγράψαι τοὺς ἐγκαταλιπόντας καὶ περιδόντας τὸν κίνδυνον;

In E there are no indications of lacunae. The corrections in B (apart from Φοίβῳ in line 3) are unsatisfactory. The bare pronoun τοῦτο referring to the epigram quoted two or three lines before is suspicious.

The passage in Thucydides (i. 132. 2) which Plutarch is using directly or indirectly quotes the epigram and continues:

τὸ μὲν οὖν ἐλεγείον οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐξεκόλαψαν εὐθὺς τότε ἀπὸ τοῦ τρίποδος τοῦτο καὶ ἐπέγραψαν ὀνομαστὶ τὰς πόλεις ὅσαι ξυγκαθελοῦσαι τὸν βάρβαρον ἔστησαν τὸ ἀνάθημα.

On the basis of this passage Powell restores the text of Plutarch as follows:

τοῦτο μὲν ἐξεκόλαψαν (ἀπὸ τοῦ τρίποδος τὸ ἐλεγείον, τοῦτο δὲ ἐπέγραψαν) τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν πόλεων, ὥσπερ ἦν δίκαιον.

The omission in the original of E was due to homoeoteleuton. The corrector, conscious of the lack of a verb with τὰ ὀνόματα, inserted δὲ and ἐνεχάραξαν, which was suggested to him by ἐκχαράξαντας below. That Plutarch wrote ἐπέγραψαν, following Thucydides, is indicated by his use of ἐπέγραψεν in line 1 and ἐπιγράψαι in line 9.

A further false conjecture is found in B in line 8, where for ἀπεστῶ E has ἀπο...., as in 872F (cf. above, p. 97, n. 8), and B has ἀπόλειψιν. The true reading is to be deduced from Hdt. ix. 85. 3.

1073A *de communibus notitiis* 28

καὶ τίς ἔρωτα γινώσκει τοιοῦτον, ὃς ἅμα σώματος μοχθηρίᾳ ψυχῆς βλεπομένη συνέχεται καὶ ἄγεται, κάλλους δ' ἅμα φρονήσει μετὰ δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης ἐγγυγνομένου, κατασβέννεται καὶ ἀπομαραίνεται;

The speaker is criticizing the Stoic view that those who have fallen in love with the young, whose baseness and folly makes them ugly, fall out of love as soon as the object of their love takes on the true beauty bestowed by wisdom.

The text given is that of E. For ἄγεται B has γίνεται, which is adopted by Bernardakis together with Wytttenbach's correction of βλεπομένη to βλαπτομένου. But the corruption lies deeper.

ἄγεται may conceivably be right, or may represent an original compound, such as ἀνάγεται or ἐπάγεται (cf. a few lines below: ἦν δὲ . . . ἔμφασιν κάλλους ἐπαγωγὸν εἶναι τοῦ ἔρωτος λέγουσι). On the other hand, γίνεται cannot be right and can only be a conjecture.

1108C *adversus Coloten* 2

οὐ μόνον 'αἰσχρὸν (σω)πάν.' ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὅσιον ἐνδοῦναί τι καὶ ὑφελέσθαι τῆς ἄκρας ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν παρρησίας . . .

For a lacuna in E of 4-5 letters B here supplies the missing letters in a well-known fragment of Euripides. Cf. Nauck, p. 619, fr. 796 Eur.

<sup>1</sup> ἄλλως τε πῶς EB.

<sup>2</sup> ἀπο (lac. 3 litt.) E, ἀπόλειψιν B.

In view, then, of the lack of any differences between E and B which cannot be explained as due either to accidental error or to conjectural emendation, we are led to the conclusion already suggested by the external evidence, that B is a descendant of E. There will have been some intermediate manuscript, a copy of E, which was worked over by a scholar who filled in lacunae and inserted conjectures of his own. If we call this intermediate manuscript  $\eta$  the tradition in *moralia* 70-7 will be represented by the stemma:

E  
|  
 $\eta$   
|  
B

It follows that for these treatises the readings of B have no place in the *apparatus criticus* except as conjectures, and that the only basis for further restoration of the text is the study of E.<sup>1</sup>

G. R. MANTON.

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.

<sup>1</sup> The Aldine text was based entirely on B (cf. Pohlenz, *op. cit.*, p. xii), and little use was made of E before Wytenbach, who thought it possible that B was derived from E, though he supposed that the scribe had other MSS. at hand. But since the time of Treu all editors of these treatises have regarded the two MSS. as independent (cf. Bernardakis, Paton, Pohlenz, Sieveking, Hubert, Flacelière, Raingeard, *opp. citt.*) Of the passages cited by Treu to prove the independence of B some merely show that B is in error; the rest are included among the 160 referred to above. Flacelière (*op. cit.*, p. 84) lays great stress on

three instances cited by Treu in which B has lacunae where E has none. But such differences cannot be used to prove independence and they are in fact easily explained: in 407F B reads  $\kappa\alpha$  before a lacuna as against  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  in E, also before a lacuna, an omission on the part of B too slight to deserve attention; in 770C B has a lacuna where E has none in an obviously corrupt passage—i.e. a conjectural lacuna; and in 873C B has a lacuna for  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  in E, but although  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  is right the punctuation in E and a corruption immediately following make the word unintelligible and explain the omission in B.

THE  
to 'r  
writi  
the f  
to se  
"  
gam  
to co  
and  
re-ex  
ment  
comp  
his f  
exper  
that  
who  
inevi  
previ  
achie  
T  
of the  
meas  
time  
Henc  
the h  
occas  
had r  
truth  
the di  
did n  
meas  
of the  
excell  
panto  
exam  
be ke  
meas  
all of  
here t  
firmed  
period

it was

<sup>1</sup> An  
tion of t  
70 ff., w

## GREEK RECORD-KEEPING AND RECORD-BREAKING

THE celebration of the revived Olympic games in London in the summer of 1948 gave to 'records' an unusually prominent place in men's thoughts and in their speech and writing, and we instinctively turn back to the ancient Greek world, which witnessed the foundation of the Olympic festival and its long history of wellnigh twelve centuries, to seek traces of any similar phenomenon.

'The Greek', says E. Norman Gardiner in his admirable account of the Greek games, 'did not care for records, and he kept no records. It is futile, therefore, to try to compare the performances of Greek athletes and of modern' (*Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, 2). With this latter sentence we may well agree, but the former invites re-examination, especially in view of the outstanding feature of the Hellenic temperament which Gardiner stresses on the following page, where he says 'The love of competition was characteristic of the Greek. In whatever he did, he sought to excel his fellows.' In the atmosphere suggested by this description we should naturally expect the record-hunting and record-keeping spirit to flourish, and the statement that 'the Greek did not care for records' is either paradoxical or untrue. The athlete who in any contest showed himself superior to all his competitors would almost inevitably like to think of himself as superior also to those who had competed on previous occasions and to those who in future years would seek to equal or surpass his achievement.

The solution of the problem seems, at least in part, to be this. Many of the records of the modern Olympic or other games are expressed in terms of time, time accurately measured to the tenth of a second. Now for the Greeks such precise measurements of time were impossible in the absence of stop-watches or indeed watches of any kind. Hence for such events as the *στάδιον*, the *δίαυλος*, the *δόλιχος*, the *ὀπλίτης δρόμος*, and the horse- and chariot-races no records were, or could be, kept, and though on any occasion the spectators might feel convinced that no one within their own memory had run so fast as the winner of the contest just decided, there was no proof of the truth of this impression, still less any means of comparison between the recent and the distant past. Again, many of the events in the programme of the ancient festivals did not lend themselves, any more than their modern counterparts, to quantitative measurement of any kind. In what terms can we register the strength and dexterity of the wrestler or the boxer, the sweetness and skill of the singer or the musician, the excellence of the poet, the eloquence of the encomiast, or the virtues of the mime or pantomime? Therefore records could not be established in them any more than, for example, in the contests of a Welsh eisteddfod; and the field in which records could be kept and broken was narrowly restricted to that in which the performance is measured not in time but in distance, the *δισκοβολία*, the *πήδημα*, and the *ἀκοντισμός*, all of which at Olympia were comprised in the single contest of the *πένταθλον*. But here tradition accepted and perpetuated certain claims which could neither be confirmed nor disproved, made by, or on behalf of, the outstanding athletes of an early period. So long as it was believed that

πέντ' ἐπὶ πεντήκοντα πόδας πήδησε Φάυλλος,  
δίσκευσεν δ' ἑκατὸν πέντ' ἀπολειπομένων,<sup>1</sup>

it was obviously futile for any athlete of a later generation to seek to surpass these

<sup>1</sup> *Anth. Pal.* iii. 28. For a critical examination of this epigram see E. N. Gardiner, *JHS* xxiv. 70 ff., who maintains that 'it is absolutely worthless, and such as no historian would think of recognising' (p. 79).



records; as well might a herald of the Hellenistic or Roman age hope to vie with brazen-voiced Stentor,

ὅς τόσον ἀδῆσασχ', ὅσον ἄλλοι πεντήκοντα.<sup>1</sup>

These considerations will help to explain why, despite the highly developed competitive instincts of the Greeks, fostered by the large element of rivalry and competition which marked their educational system, the ancient world has left us very few records of the kind which we associate with athletic sports; yet we are not justified in concluding that the Greeks were indifferent to records. An examination of the inscribed monuments unearthed at Olympia leaves on our minds a very different impression. True, the inscriptions on the bases of portrait-statues of victors commemorate for the most part one or more victories won at Olympia, with occasional added references to successes gained elsewhere but without any express claim to unique achievement. But we have also a fragment<sup>2</sup> of the impressive list of the major triumphs of the famous boxer and pancratiast Theogenes<sup>3</sup> of Thasos—two at Olympia (in 480 and 476 B.C.), three at Delphi, ten at the Isthmus, and nine at Nemea—which was assigned by Foucart, Dittenberger, Frazer, and others to Dorieus of Rhodes, but has been proved to refer to Theogenes by the discovery of a similar, but perfectly preserved, list inscribed on a statue-base at Delphi (SIG 36 A), headed *Θεογένης Τιμοξένου Θάσιος ἐνίκησεν τάδε*. Whether the Olympian list was accompanied by an epigram we cannot now say; that at Delphi is preceded by a poem of uncertain date, of which the latter part is read and restored by Pomtow (SIG 36, note 2) thus:

οὐ γάρ τις Ὀλυμπίαι ἐστεφανώθη  
 ὡ[τὸς ἀνὴρ] πυγμῇ παγκρατίῳ τε κρατ[έων].  
 οὐδὲ καὶ ἐμ Πυθῶνι τριῶν στεφάνων ἀκονιτὶ  
 ἐς τόδε θνητὸς ἀνὴρ οὕτις ἔρεξε ἕτερος.  
 ἐννέα δ' Ἰσθμιάδων νίκαι δέκα, δις γὰρ αὔσεν  
 κῆρυξ ἐγ γνάλῳι μούνον ἐπιχθονίων  
 πυγμῆς παγκρατίου τ' ἐπινίκιον ἡματι τῶντῳ.  
 ἐν<ν>άκι δ' ἐν Νεμέαι, Θεόγενης· αἱ δ' ἴδιαι  
 νίκαι τρίς τε ἑκατὸν καὶ χίλιαι,<sup>4</sup> οὐδὲ σέ φημι  
 πυγμῇ νικηθῆναι ε<ξ>κοσι καὶ δὺ ἐτῶν.

Here we have the publication, in one of the chief centres of athletic rivalry, of the unique achievements of the most famous of Greek boxers, which remained, we may well believe, an unbroken record throughout the history of the Greek games. Scarcely less imposing is the summary (SIG 82; cf. Paus. 6. 7. 4), inscribed at Delphi, of thirty-six victories won in the *παγκράτιον* by Dorieus of Rhodes—three at Olympia (in 432, 428, and 424 B.C.), four at the Pythia, eight at the Isthmia, seven at the Nemea, four at the Panathenaea, four at the Asclepiea, three at the Argive Hecatombaea, and three at the Arcadian Lycaea. Such was his fame that, when in 407 he was brought to Athens as a prisoner of war, he was unconditionally released (Paus. 6. 7. 4 f.).

But we must return to Olympia. Near the statue of Theogenes stood the memorial of Cynisca, daughter of the Spartan king Archidamus I and sister of Agesilaus, twice

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad*, 5. 786.

<sup>2</sup> *Iv Ol* 153, SIG 36 B; cf. Paus. 6. 6. 5, II. 2.

<sup>3</sup> That this, not Theagenes, is the true form of the name appears from SIG 36 A (quoted below), as is pointed out in Pomtow's note ad loc.; cf. M. Launey, *Rev. Arch.* xviii (1941), 22 f., 49, and,

for his cult, Paus. 6. II. 8, Launey, *Études thasiennes*, I. 133 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Plutarch assigns to Theogenes 1,200 victories (*Praec. reip. ger.* 15. 7), Pausanias 1,400 (6. II. 5), while a Delphic oracle quoted by Dio Chrysostom calls him *ὁ πρὶν μυριάθλος ἀνὴρ* (31. 377 Dindorf).

victorious in the chariot-race at Olympia (probably in 396 and 392), consisting of a chariot and driver and Cynisca herself; on its base was engraved the epigram:<sup>1</sup>

Σπάρτας μὲν [βασιλῆς ἐμοί] | πατέρες καὶ ἀδελφοί,  
ἀ[ρματι δ' ὠκυπόδων ἵππων] | νικῶσα Κυνίσκα  
εἰκόνα τάνδ' ἔστασε· μόν[αν] | δ' ἐμέ φαμι γυναικῶν  
Ἑλλάδος ἐκ πάσας τό[ν]δε λαβὲν στέφανον.

Pausanias, who himself saw and described this monument, confirms this record in the words *πρώτη γε ἵπποτρόφῃσε γυναικῶν καὶ νίκην ἀνείλετο Ὀλυμπικὴν πρώτη* (3. 8. 1; cf. 6. 1. 6). Another base bore the statue of Xenombrotus of Cos, also described by Pausanias (6. 14. 12), and the epigram (*Iv Ol* 170):

[αὐτὰ πνευθ]μένους ἐτύμα φάτις, ἱπ[πάδ]α [νίκαν]  
[κείναι καλλίσταν] εἶναι Ὀλυμπιάδι,  
[ἄι Κ]ώων δ[σ]ι[ον δρομ]ικοῦ Πισαῖον ἄεθλον  
πρώτος ἐλὼν Μέροπος νᾶσον ἐσαγάχ[ετο]  
τοῖο[ς] ὁποῖον δ[ρ]αῖς Ξεινόμβροτο[ς]· ἄ δέ νυν] Ἑλλάς  
ἄφθιτον αἰεῖδε[ι] μνωμένα ἵπποσύνας,

while below the statue of Acestorides, the third-century Trojan charioteer, stood an epigram (*Iv Ol* 184), beginning:

πρώτος ἐγὼ Τρώων Πισάτιδος ἔρνει ἐλαίας  
στεφθεῖς καρύχθην, τοῦνομ' Ἀκεστορίδης,

and proceeding to recount victories won at Lusi, Epidaurus, Pheneus, and Nemea.

Other examples of similar claims may be found among the Olympian inscriptions or in Pausanias' account of the victor-statues in the Altis. The yield of Delphi is disappointingly meagre. The Pythian festival fell far short of the Olympian in athletic prestige, though surpassing it in musical fame, and Pausanias at the outset of his account of Delphi, after making a disparaging reference to flautists and other musicians, dismisses the athletes on the ground that the most famous of them, with the sole exception of Phayllus of Croton, won Olympian victories and so have been already described in his Elean narrative.<sup>2</sup> Yet there too, and also at Nemea and the Isthmus, there were doubtless inscriptions claiming records of various kinds, while at Sparta the long list of victories won in the fifth century in running and chariot-racing by Damonon and his son Enymacratidas is introduced by the metrical dedication (*IG* v(1). 213. 1-5):

Δαμόνον | ἀνέθεκε ἈθENAΙΑ[ι] | ΠΟΛΙΑΧΟΙ  
νικᾶσας | ταυτᾶ, ἡᾶτ' οὐδὲς || πέποκα τὸν νῦν.

The passages so far quoted have been in verse, with its special appeal to the imagination and the memory, but we have also examples, even before the Christian era, of similar claims stated in prose, and that not only in the sphere of athletics. From the anonymous tract *περὶ κωμωδίας*, 17, we learn that Menander created a new record, for *εἰδίδαξε πρῶτος ἐφηβος ὦν ἐπὶ Φιλοκλέους ἀρχοντος*,<sup>3</sup> i.e. in the spring of

<sup>1</sup> *Iv Ol* 160, *Anth. Pal.* xiii. 16, F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Hist. gr. Epigr.* 63. Cf. Xen. *Ages.* 9. 6, Plut. *Ages.* 20. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Paus. 10. 9. 2 αὐλητὰς μὲν οὖν καὶ ὅσοι ἀγωνιστοὶ μουσικῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῖς πλείοσιν ἐγένοντο μετὰ οὐδενὸς λογιζομένου, οὐ πάντι ἡγοῦμαι σπουδῆς ἀξίους· ἀθλητὰς δὲ ὅπόσοι τι καὶ ὑπελπίοντο εἰς δόξαν, ἐν λόγῳ σφᾶς ἐδήλωσα τῷ ἐς Ἡλείους.

<sup>3</sup> The MS. reading *πρῶτος* is preferable to the

emendation *πρῶτον* accepted by some scholars. Menander, it seems, was the first dramatist admitted to compete in his own name while still an ἐφηβος. The fact may well have been noted in the dramatic *Didascalíae* (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup>. 2319-232), where to the name of the comedian Aminias, placed third at the Dionysia of 311, is appended the note [οὗτος] ἐφηβος ὦν ἐνεμήθη (2323a. 47). In the Dionysiac *Fasti* innovations are occasionally registered (2318. 202 f., 317 f.).

321 B.C., and a Delphian inscription of about 194 B.C., honouring a flautist, states that *τούτῳ πρώτῳ συμβέβηκεν μόνῳ | ἀνεῖν ἀνταγωνιστῶν αὐλῆσαι*.<sup>1</sup> Among sporting records few, if any, were better known than that set up by Alcibiades at Olympia in the summer of 416. His own account, as reported by Thucydides (6. 16. 2), runs thus: *ἄρματα μὲν ἑπτὰ καθῆκα, ὅσα οὐδεὶς πω ἰδιώτης πρότερον, ἐνίκησά δὲ καὶ δεύτερος καὶ τέταρτος ἐγενόμην*. An alternative version, represented by Euripides' *Ἐπινίκιον*<sup>2</sup> and accepted by Isocrates, enhances Alcibiades' triumph by awarding him the first, second, and third places in the race. Plutarch regards this as a record both from the point of view of the number of chariots entered by one competitor and from that of the successes won, *ἑπτὰ γὰρ ἄλλος οὐδεὶς καθῆκεν Ὀλυμπίᾳ ἰδιώτης οὐδὲ βασιλεὺς* (note this addition to the Thucydidean claim), *μόνος δ' ἐκείνος. καὶ τὸ νικῆσαι καὶ δεύτερον γενέσθαι καὶ τέταρτον ὡς Θουκυδίδης φησὶν, ὡς δ' Εὐριπίδης τρίτον, ὑπερβάλλει καὶ λαμπρότητι καὶ δόξῃ πᾶσαν τὴν ἐν τούτοις φιλοτιμίαν* (*Alc.* 11). In Isocrates' speech composed for Clinias, Alcibiades' son, the claim is further emphasized in the words *οὐ μόνον τοὺς ἀνταγωνιστὰς ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς πώποτε νικήσαντας ὑπερβάλετο*. *Ζεύγη γὰρ καθῆκε τσαῦτα μὲν τὸν ἀριθμὸν, ὅσοις οὐδ' αἱ μέγ. σται τῶν πόλεων ἡγωνίσαντο, τοιαῦτα δὲ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὥστε καὶ πρῶτος καὶ δεύτερος γενέσθαι καὶ τρίτος* (16. 33 f.). Needless to add, this success received unparalleled advertisement, both in the sumptuous entertainment at Olympia which followed it and in the permanent memorials at Athens which perpetuated its memory.<sup>3</sup>

In the Hellenistic age we hear comparatively little of records made or broken. Those established by the great athletes of the sixth and fifth centuries stood unassailable. The progressive depopulation and impoverishment of Hellas, culminating in the conditions described in Sulpicius' famous letter to Cicero (*ad Fam.* 4. 5. 4), no doubt played their part; travel was rendered difficult and hazardous by the depredations of pirates and brigands and the neglect of the road-system, as well as by the almost incessant wars which marked the rivalries of the empires of the Diadochi and the rise of Rome to unquestioned supremacy in the Mediterranean world. These wars drained the financial resources not only of Italy but of all the Roman provinces, especially those of the East, turned the thoughts of strong and ambitious young men to military service, and took a heavy toll of life and health.

With the establishment of the principate under Augustus a new era dawned. The *pax Romana*, though occasionally violated, became the normal experience of the Roman Empire, piracy and brigandage were suppressed, the roads were repaired and maintained, and travel became relatively easy and safe.<sup>4</sup> At the same time there was a marked increase in prosperity, especially in the great cities of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, and from this fertile soil sprang a rich crop of new festivals, many of them Imperial foundations, affording to those who excelled in any field represented in the competitions opportunities of winning fame and gain. 'The old festivals', writes Gardiner,<sup>5</sup> 'were celebrated with increased splendour and ceremony, new festivals were introduced in close imitation of them, sumptuous race-courses and gymnasia were provided not merely in Greece but in Italy and in Rome herself,

<sup>1</sup> Fouilles, iii(3). 128 (= SIG 648 B). 2 f.

<sup>2</sup> Bergk, *Poet. Lyr. Graeci*, ii, p. 266, (τὸ) κάλ. λιστον (8') ὃ μῆδεῖς ἄλλος Ἑλλάνων (ἐλαχες), | ἄρματι πρῶτα δρᾶμειν καὶ δεύτερα καὶ τρίτα. I need not here discuss the question whether Alcibiades' success was gained by fair means or foul ([Andoc.] 4. 25 f., Diod. 13. 74, Plut. *Alc.* 12).

<sup>3</sup> Mr. G. T. Griffith has called my attention to a modern sporting record which provides a remarkable parallel to Alcibiades' Olympic triumph. In the St. Leger of 1932 H.H. the Aga

Khan ran four horses and won the first, second, and fourth places with Firdaussi, Dastur, and Udaipur respectively.

<sup>4</sup> L. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*, i. 268, says 'Travelling throughout most of the Roman Empire was easy, swift and secure to a degree unknown until the beginning of the nineteenth century'.

<sup>5</sup> *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, 167; cf. *Athletics of the Ancient World*, 106.

athlet  
and h  
rewar  
honou  
sphere  
and in  
sion) c  
ism, o  
which

Tw  
for rec  
confir  
centur  
readily  
an act  
to his  
and su  
them c  
couche  
of the  
leading  
them t  
the un  
especia  
glory a  
Be

Be  
epigram  
compet

<sup>1</sup> Op.  
prae f. 1.

<sup>2</sup> The  
notes an

<sup>3</sup> IG  
arch. B.

first of  
edition  
the wor  
elsewher  
and M  
everywh  
rectiline  
I think  
interesti  
served i  
apparen  
woman  
feat ach  
xxiii. 25  
scription  
restorati  
Et. Anc.  
whose na  
and ὁπλ  
absolute  
δίαυλον,



athletic guilds were formed; and though the athletic revival was purely professional and had little effect on the people, whether of Greece or Rome, the privileges and rewards showered on the successful athletes were certainly no less substantial if less honourable than those bestowed on the victors of the fifth century B.C.' In every sphere of life men craved to achieve, and to commemorate, some unique distinction, and in reading the relevant inscriptions (where this craving finds its clearest expression) of the Antonine age 'we feel ourselves in another world, a world of professionalism, of self-advertisement, and of records, which bears no little resemblance to that in which we are living to-day. . . . It was an age of record-breaking.'<sup>1</sup>

Two points in this description call for brief comment. Firstly, though this mania for records comes to a head in the time of Hadrian and the Antonines, it is by no means confined to this period, but has left abundant epigraphical traces dating from the first century of our era and the reign of Trajan. Secondly, we must beware of using too readily the derogatory term 'self-advertisement'. The fame of an athlete, a jockey, an actor, an artist, a musician, or an author is not necessarily in inverse proportion to his modesty. Outstanding excellence and success inevitably attract enthusiasts and supporters, eager to assert the unique nature of their hero's achievements; to them doubtless are due many of the inscriptions in question, which are very rarely couched in the first person, as is that, for instance, of Cynisca. But this glorification of the successful performer is not limited to individuals; cities vie in honouring the leading athletes, musicians, and actors by passing laudatory decrees and admitting them to citizenship, and they must needs seek to justify these steps by emphasizing the unparalleled successes won by the recipients. For the fame of an athlete, and especially of an *Ὀλυμπιονίκης* or, still more, a *περιοδονίκης*, shed on his city a reflected glory and therefore demanded the utmost publicity.

Be that as it may, the Imperial period witnessed the frequent publication in epigraphical form<sup>2</sup> of records achieved in athletics or in other fields of agonistic competition by runners,<sup>3</sup> wrestlers and pancratiasts,<sup>4</sup> boxers,<sup>5</sup> musicians,<sup>6</sup> heralds,<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. 178, 181; for honours etc., cf. Vit. 9, praef. 1.

<sup>2</sup> The lists of inscriptions given in the following notes are illustrative and incomplete.

<sup>3</sup> *IG Rom* iii. 370. 5 f., *CIG* 2682. 5 ff., *Bull. Soc. arch. Bulg.* iii. 191 (= *Θρηκικά*, 8. 82). In the first of these Cagnat takes over from the first edition (J. R. S. Sterrett, *Wolfe Expedition*, 413) the word *δολεχ[ο]δρομέα*, which does not occur elsewhere: in Sterrett's copy *X* is followed by *A* and *M* by a dotted, and so doubtful, *ε* (though everywhere else in this inscription *ε* has the rectilinear form *E*), and there is no further letter; I think we should read *δολεχδρομέ[ν]*. Some interesting records of long-distance runs are preserved in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 7. 84. *SIG* 802 *A* 8 apparently celebrates the first victory won by a woman in the *στάδιον* at the Pythian games, a feat achieved in A.D. 39 (A. B. West, *Cl. Phil.* xxiii. 258 ff.). Specially noteworthy is the inscription of a Milesian runner, *Milet*, i(9). 369, the restoration of which L. Robert emends in *Rev. Ét. Anc.* xxxi. 14 f., 19 f. The athlete in question, whose name has perished, won the men's *δίαυλος* and *ὁπλίτης* at Olympia in 20 B.C. He set up absolute records in winning the men's *[σ]τάδιον*, *δίαυλον*, *ὁπλίτην* κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς ἐν ταῖς αὐταῖς ||

*ἐναυτῶν* at the Nemea (a 4 f.), and in winning the same three contests ἐν τῇ || *[αὐ]τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* at the *Ἄκτια τὰ μεγάλα* || *[Και]σάρη* (a 9 f.), while in other distinctions he was first τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς *Ἀσίας* (a 9) or τῶν *Ἰώνων* (a 13, 15) or *Μηλοίων* (a 14). A pancratiast claims as a unique feat that he contested, presumably with success, *τριετία τὰς τρεῖς κρίσεις, παῖδα*, | ἀγένοιον, ἄνδρα (*CIG* 2810 b 9 f.), while a Delphian inscription (*Fouilles*, iii(6). 143. 6 f.) describes a flute-player as μόνον καὶ πρῶτον τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀνθρώπων ἐκκαίδεκα ἐτῶν ἀρ(ξ)άμενον τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀγωνίζεσθαι, if L. Robert's restoration of a corrupt text is right (*Rev. Phil.* iv (1930), 55 f.); Robert also restores *BMI* 613 (*Hellenica*, vii. 110 f.).

<sup>4</sup> *IG* xiv. 746. 11, 747, *Iv Ol* 54. 37 f. (= *SIG* 1073. 48 f.), 234, *Iv Magn* 180. 3 f., *CIG* 2810 b 7 ff., 22 ff. (cf. *Rev. Phil.* iv. 27 f.), *IG Rom* iv. 1344. 4 f. In this last inscription I fail to understand Lafaye's note on τῇ σκῇ 'Ὀλυμ[μ]ν[ι]άδι, 'De Olympiis Magnetum cf. titulum Trallensem, *C.I.Gr.*, 2933, et Krause, *Olympia*, p. 218. Olympiades vero quando inceperint, non liquet', for the phrase νικήσαντα 'Ὀλύμπια τὰ μεγάλα ἐν Πείσῃ proves (cf. L. Robert, *Rev. Phil.* iv. 43) that the Olym-

See over for footnotes 5, 6, and 7.

poets,<sup>1</sup> and various kinds of actors.<sup>2</sup> In many cases long lists of victories are given, numbering scores or even hundreds (e.g. *IG* xiv. 739), the credit of which is often enhanced by the insertion of epithets such as ἀλειπτος, ἀδιαφθήγτος, or the like, or of the phrase κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς or καθεξῆς (e.g. *Fouilles*, iii(1). 555; cf. L. Robert, *Rev. Phil.* iv. 51), while laudatory titles are accumulated, such as ἀριστος Ἑλλήνων, παράδοξος, πλειστονίκης, περιοδονίκης, ἱερονίκης, Ὀλυμπιονίκης, and so on,<sup>3</sup> or a clause is inserted such as ταλαντιαῖους δὲ καὶ ἡμιταλαντιαίους (sc. ἀγῶνας) ἐν||[κα] ἅπαντας οὓς ἡγωνίσαστο (*CIG* 2810. 18 ff.).

But these records extend over a wider field than that of the contests comprised in the numerous ἀγῶνες of the Greek world. The same phraseology is applied to unparalleled honours received in the political and religious sphere, e.g. to the special tenure of priesthoods,<sup>4</sup> the grant of unexampled distinctions,<sup>5</sup> the unique cumulation of political offices,<sup>6</sup> the exercise of a magistracy with extraordinary brilliance,<sup>7</sup> the first bestowal of citizenship on a woman,<sup>8</sup> the foundation of games,<sup>9</sup> and the enrichment of the State by some unequalled benefaction.<sup>10</sup> When, towards the close of A.D. 67, Nero ended his record-breaking tour of Hellas, he claimed to establish a record in Imperial munificence by granting autonomy to the whole province, πόλεις μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλοι ἡλευθέρωσαν ἡγεμόνες, | [[Νέρων δὲ μόνος κα]]ῖ ἐπαρχίαν (*SIG* 814. 25 f.), and in his address of thanks the high-priest of the Augusti, Epaminondas of Acraephia, was careful to maintain the same phraseology, τὴν ἀπὸ | παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος αὐθιγενῆ ἐλευ|θερίαν, πρότερον ἀφαιρεθεῖσαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων, εἰς || καὶ μόνος τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος αὐτοκράτωρ μέγιστος | φιλέλλην γενόμενος [[Νέρων]] Ζεὺς Ἑλευθέριος ἔδω|κεν κτλ. (*ibid.* 37 ff.).

What is the Greek word for 'record'? I do not know, but I suggest ὑπερβολή, though I know no example of its use in precisely this sense and the word does not occur in any of the epigraphical texts on which the present article is based, except in the phrase καθ' ὑπερβολήν, which approaches this meaning in *OGI* 315. 15 and 472. 8. But the primary notion of the word is that of 'out-throwing' (e.g. with discus or dart), and we have found ὑπερβάλλω or ὑπερβάλλομαι in the passages of Plutarch and Isocrates quoted above (p. 108), while the verb has the same sense in ὑπερβαλόντα ἐπιδόσσειν | καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς φιλοτιμίαις το[ύς] | πώποτε πεφίλοτ[ι]μῆμένους (*OGI* 544. 15 ff.; cf. 28 f., 545. 10 f.) and ὥστε τοὺς | ἀπ' αἰῶνος ὑπερβαλέσθαι (*OGI* 542. 10 f.), and I am tempted to wonder whether the word may not have the same meaning in the famous inscription of Bybion at Olympia (*SIG* 1071).<sup>11</sup> Usually, however, the idea was expressed in

piad in question is that of the Elean Olympia and corresponds to A.D. 137. *IG Rom* iv. 1064 (= *SIG* 1065) commemorates an athlete who repeatedly won the πένταθλον, once the στάδιον and πένταθλον on the same day, once the στάδιον alone and once the παγκράτιον.

<sup>5</sup> *IG* ii<sup>2</sup>. 3163. 3 ff., *IG Rom* iii. 1012. 3 ff., iv. 1519 b 1 f.

<sup>6</sup> *IG* xiv. 737. 5, *CIG* 1720. 6 f. (cf. L. Robert, *Rev. Phil.* iv. 55 f.), 2810. 3 ff., *IG Rom* iv. 1432. 3 f., *Fouilles*, iii(1). 547. 12 f., iii(3). 128. L. Robert, *Rev. Phil.* iv. 56 f.

<sup>7</sup> *IG* ii<sup>2</sup>. 3169. 35 f., *Iv Ol* 237. 5 f.

<sup>8</sup> *Fouilles*, iii(1). 89. 2 f. (cf. *Rev. Phil.* iv. 54).

<sup>9</sup> *Fouilles*, iii(1). 551. 3 f. (cf. L. Robert, *Hermes*, lxxv. 106 ff.), *Ephesos*, ii. 71. 8 ff. (cf. *Hermes*, lxxv. 113 f.), *Wien. Anz.* 1945, 10 ff. The first two of these relate to pantomimes (τραγικῆς ἐνρῦθμον κινήσεως ὑποκριτῆς), the third to a βιολόγος.

<sup>10</sup> For ἀριστος Ἑλλήνων see L. Robert, *Rev. Ét.*

*Anc.* xxxi. 13 ff. An impressive title is borne by a trumpeter, Καπιτωλ[ι]ονείκης ἐπὶ Ῥώμης, Τρισποθιονείκης, Δεκαολυμπιονείκης, Δωδεκαακτιονείκης, Τρισκαίδεκαασκληπτονείκης, Νεμονείκης (*BGU* 1074, re-edited by P. Viereck, *Klio*, viii. 417).

<sup>4</sup> *IG* ii<sup>2</sup>. 3538 (= *SIG* 790). 6 f., *IG Rom* i. 1096. 4 f., 10 ff., *BCH* li. 83.

<sup>5</sup> *IG* v(1). 467. 10 ff., *JRS* xxxiii. 39. Cf. *Hdt.*

8. 124. 3 μόνον δὲ τοῦτον πάντων ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν Σπαρτιῆται πρόεπεψαν, 9. 35. 1 μόνου δὲ δὴ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐγένοντο οὗτοι Σπαρτιῆται πολῖται.

<sup>6</sup> *IG* v(1). 541. 14 ff., 542. 9 ff.

<sup>7</sup> *Iv Priene*, 114. 24 f. <sup>8</sup> *SIG* 802 A 16 f.

<sup>9</sup> *IG* vii. 2712. 24 f. (cf. *BCH* lix. 446), ix(1). 90. 3 f.

<sup>10</sup> *IG* vii. 2712. 36, 53 f., 73, *CIG* 3617. 7 ff., *SEG* iii. 422. 4 f., *BCH* li. 92, 95, *IG Rom* iii. 69. 14.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *IG* vii. 2712. 53 f. ὑπερ[εβάλλετο] δὲ τῇ μεγαλοφυχίᾳ καὶ ἀρετῇ πάντας τοὺς | [πρότερους], L. Robert, *Ét. épigr. et philol.* 46.

very simple and almost stereotyped formulae, whose keywords are *εἰς*, *πρῶτος*, and *μόνος*, varied by combination and by the addition of phrases lending emphasis and impressiveness.

*εἰς* is frequently strengthened in Greek literature by an added epithet. In the *Iliad* we find *ἕνα οἶον* and *μία οἶη*, in the *Odyssey* *μία οἶη* seven times and *μία μούνη* once, in the *Hymn to Hermes* *ἕνα μούνον*. Herodotus uses *εἰς μούνος* four times, and *εἰς μόνος* occurs in Sophocles and in Aristophanes. Later *εἰς καὶ μόνος*, the exact counterpart of our familiar 'one and only', appears (e.g. Dion. Hal. i. 74. 3), and this is the only form found in the inscriptions under consideration; we have noticed (p. 110) the phrase, still further strengthened by the addition of *τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος*, in Epaminondas' acknowledgement of Nero's bounty. Here *αἰών* denotes the whole of past time, the whole course of human history.<sup>1</sup> L. Robert has convincingly shown that for *εἰς αἰῶνας ἀπ' αἰῶνος*, found in most editions of Tertullian, *De spectaculis* 25, we must substitute *εἰς ἀπ' αἰῶνος*, and adds 'Cette innocente formule signifie: le premier de tous les temps passés, l'unique, l'inégalé, le supérieur à tous ses prédécesseurs. Tout homme qui vient de battre un record est, en ce domaine et jusqu'à ce que son record soit à son tour battu par un autre, *εἰς ἀπ' αἰῶνος*, *εἰς τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος*' (*Études épigr. et philol.* 108 ff.). More recently G. Björck has pointed out (*Eranos*, xlv. 72 ff.) that in the phrase *θεωρήσατε ἕνα ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀπαγόμε[ενο]ν γυμνασιάρχον καὶ πρε[σ]βευτὴν Ἀλεξανδρέων*, which occurs in the 'Acts of Appianus' (*Pap. Oxy.* 33 iii 9 ff.), *ἕνα ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀπαγόμε[ενο]ν* cannot mean, as interpreted by Grenfell and Hunt,<sup>2</sup> 'led off to death'; but his own rendering, 'voici que l'on entraîne une personne sans pareil, gymnasiarque et ambassadeur des Alexandrins', seems to me to miss the point, which is, if I understand the passage aright, that never before in human history had a gymnasiarch and envoy of the Alexandrians been thus haled to execution.

Commoner than *εἰς* is *πρῶτος*, indicating a claim to priority. Occasionally this stands alone,<sup>3</sup> but more often it is strengthened by the addition of *τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος* or *ἀνθρώπων* or *πάντων*,<sup>4</sup> or restricted by that of an ethnic or other word or phrase.<sup>5</sup> *Μόνος* also occurs as the assertion of uniqueness of achievement, either alone (*IG* vii. 2712. 36) or stressed by an added *τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος* (*Iv Ol* 237. 5) or *ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀνδρῶν* (ibid. 54. 37), or limited by a local restriction (*IG Rom* iii. 1012. 3 *μόνος ἐγὼ ἐκ τῆς ἐαυτοῦ πατριδ[ος]*).<sup>6</sup> But by far the commonest phrase is the combination *μόνος καὶ πρῶτος* or *πρῶτος καὶ μόνος*, used interchangeably, whereas with us 'first and only' is familiar but 'only and first' is unknown. This suggests a weakness of thought and expression on the part of the Greeks, for while *μόνος* includes *πρῶτος*, *πρῶτος* does not necessarily involve *μόνος*. We may say, for example, that Captain Webb first swam the Channel

<sup>1</sup> For a careful analysis of the meaning of *αἰών* and *αἰῶνος* see F. H. Brabant, *Time and Eternity in Christian Thought*, 240 ff. *Αἰών* as one looks back normally denotes the whole of past time, as one looks forward the whole future, all time to come. It occurs very often in the 'record-inscriptions', nearly always preceded by *ἀπὸ*, in such phrases as *ἀπ' αἰῶνος*, *ἀπὸ τοῦ (παντός) αἰῶνος*, *ἀπὸ παντός τοῦ αἰῶνος*, *ἀπ' αἰῶνος καὶ μέχρι νῦν*. For *εἰς (τὸν) αἰῶνα* see L. Robert, *Ét. épigr. et philol.* 108 ff.; for other prepositional phrases, Liddell and Scott, s.v. *αἰών*. Cf. the epigram in honour of the Athenian historian Dexippus (*IG* ii<sup>2</sup>. 3669. 10 f.):

ὁς ἱστορίην ἐσαθρήσας  
αἰῶνος δολιχὴν ἀτρικέως ἔφρασεν.

<sup>2</sup> *Pap. Oxy.* i, p. 68; cf. C. B. Welles, *Trans.*

*Am. Phil. Ass.* lxvii. 17, F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch*, i. 39. The papyrus is republished in Wilcken, *Chrestomathie*, 20.

<sup>3</sup> *IG* v(1). 467. 10; cf. 213. 36, 258. 9 f., *IG* ii<sup>2</sup>. 3687. 4, 3270, *JHS* xlii. 168.

<sup>4</sup> *Τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος IG Rom* i. 1096. 4, *IG* ii<sup>2</sup>. 3538 (= *SIG* 790). 6 f.—*ἀνθρώπων IG* xiv. 746. 11, 747 (eight times), *CIG* 2682. 7—*πάντων Milet*, i(9). 369 a (twice)—*πρώτη ἀπ' αἰῶνος SIG* 802 A 16 f.

<sup>5</sup> *Ἰασέων CIG* 2682. 5 f., *Κώων SIG* 1065. 4, *Ἀφροδισιέων CIG* 2810 b 22 f. (cf. *Rev. Phil.* iv. 27 f.), *τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος γυμνασιάρχων*, *ἐξηγη- τευσάντων IG Rom* i. 1096. 10 ff., *πρώτη παρθένων SIG* 802 A 8. For other examples see p. 109, n. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Hdt. i. 25 *μόνος δὲ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, *Lys.* xxiv. 9 *μόνος ἀνθρώπων*, *IG* vii. 2712. 73 δ *μηδεὶς ἄλλος τῶν προτέρων ἐποίησεν*, *SEG* vi. 61.



or Blériot first flew from France to Britain; in both cases *πρῶτος* is appropriate but *μόνος* is not, since these feats have been repeated many times subsequently. In other words, *μόνος* adds to a preceding *πρῶτος* the assertion that the record still stands unbroken, whereas *πρῶτος* following *μόνος* is otiose. Nevertheless, in twenty-two out of thirty-six examples under consideration *μόνος* precedes *πρῶτος*. An attempt at originality is seen in two cases, *πρῶτον | τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος καὶ μέχρι | νῦν μόνον* (CIG 3617. 7 ff.) and *μόνος ἀλλητῶν καὶ | πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων* (Fouilles, iii(1). 547. 12 f.).

But even the combination of *μόνος* and *πρῶτος* did not always satisfy. For the sake of emphasis phrases are added—*ἀπ' αἰῶνος, τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος* (five times), *τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος, ἀπὸ τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος, τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀνθρώπων* (thrice)—or the reference is limited locally, temporally, or professionally by phrases like *τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας, μετὰ τὸν πόλεμον, τῶν ἐπὶ φωνασκίᾳ*, though here also an *αἰών*-phrase is often inserted for the sake of greater effect, as in *τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ πατρίδος, τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος Μαγνήτων, τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος πυκτῶν οἱ κηρύκων οἱ κυκλίων ἀλλητῶν, πάντων ἀπ' αἰῶνος χο[ραυλῶν]*.

In Latin inscriptions, so far as I can judge by a cursory glance, such claims are not only relatively rare but surprisingly modest. Occasionally the word *primus* (Dessau, *ILS* 5056 f., 5173, 5234?), or *primus omnium* (ibid. 5060, 5196), is used to enhance the glory of some distinction or achievement, but the commonest formula I have met is *temporis sui primus* or *prima* applied to pantomimi or archimimae (ibid. 5186, 5188, 5191, 5193-5, 5211-12). It is a far cry from *temporis sui* to *ἀπ' αἰῶνος*.

In view, then, of the available evidence we may conclude that the Greeks of all periods were keenly interested in records, and that this interest would have found clearer expression but for the impossibility of precise time-measurement in the ancient world.

MARCUS N. TOD.

*Addendum.*—L. Robert has now given, in *Hellenica*, vii. 117 ff., a masterly re-edition of the Milesian inscription (*Milet*, i(9). 369) to which I repeatedly refer above, with the addition of a previously unpublished record from Didyma relating to the victories won by the same athlete.

LEXIC  
'barley  
and co  
ἀπὸ τῶ  
πυρῶν

Th  
metho  
that t  
that a  
from l

Gr  
beings  
it in so  
'hulle  
'groats  
relativ  
grain  
primit  
after t

In  
for hu  
meal,  
grain  
refer t  
partic  
Englan  
prepar  
barley

Bu  
apply

It i  
Englis  
fed to  
tion; t  
the lat  
not be  
the cas

<sup>1</sup> e.g.  
and Lar  
Wissow  
proach  
Jardé's  
(Paris,

<sup>2</sup> 73.  
<sup>4</sup> Cf.

<sup>5</sup> 'Hu  
those w  
fore the  
fitting c  
4599.

## ἄλφιτα—A NOTE

LEXICOGRAPHERS and translators have long agreed in interpreting the word ἄλφιτον as 'barley groats' or 'barley meal'.<sup>1</sup> In so doing they follow the ancient lexicographers and commentators. The *Etymologicum Magnum*,<sup>2</sup> for instance, defines ἄλφιτα as τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν πεφρυγμένων κριθῶν ἀλεσθεῖσων θραύσματα, while Eustathius<sup>3</sup> has ἄλειαρ τὸ ἀπὸ πυρῶν ἄλειαρ καθάπερ ἄλφιτον τὸ ἀπὸ κριθῆς.<sup>4</sup>

This translation implies a definite raw material—barley—in combination with a method of production on which it is rather less definite. It will here be maintained that the word implies a method of preparation rather than any particular grain, and that although—especially in post-Homeric times—ἄλφιτον was commonly prepared from barley, it was not only prepared from one cereal.

Grain as it comes from the threshing-floor is neither easily digestible by human beings nor palatable. It has, therefore, been usual since the earliest times to prepare it in some way—even before cooking or baking—when it is used for human food. With 'hulled'<sup>5</sup> grain the first stage of this preparation is the removal of the hulls, and 'groats' in English<sup>6</sup> may mean either whole grains with the hulls removed or the relatively large particles which result from a rough crushing of such grains. If the grain is ground to powder it is usually called 'meal', while 'flour'—at any rate in primitive milling—is the equivalent of meal after sifting, i.e. the powdered endosperm after the removal of some or all of the bran.

In English usage and in that of other modern languages the cereal products used for human consumption are usually referred to by such names as groats, semolina, meal, flour, etc., and their equivalents, rather than by the name given to the whole grain or the plant in the field. In some cases, however, such words, which primarily refer to a method of manufacture, become associated in the course of time with the particular cereal from which a given product is most commonly made. So 'flour' in England means wheat flour and 'groats' means groats made from oats. For products prepared in the same way from other cereals the name of the cereal is added (e.g. barley flour, wheat groats).

But whole grain is often used to feed animals; and to grain used in this way we apply the same names (e.g. wheat, barley, oats) as to the plants growing in the field.

It is the contention of this note that Greek usage was entirely analogous to that of English in this respect; that the Greek names for plants in the field and whole grain fed to animals are different from those denoting cereal products for human consumption; that words like ἄλφιτα and ἀλείατα, etc., which are used from Homer onwards in the latter sense, refer primarily to a method of manufacture; that they must therefore not be connected, without further evidence, with any particular cereal; and that in the case of ἄλφιτα there is no such evidence for Homeric times.

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Liddell and Scott, Autenrieth, Butcher and Lang, etc.; cf. also Orth on *Gerste* in Pauly-Wissowa (vol. vii, col. 1281). The nearest approach to the view now put forward appears in Jardé's *Les Céréales dans l'antiquité grecque* (Paris, 1925, p. 124, n. 8).

<sup>2</sup> 73, 16, cf. below, p. 116, n. 4. <sup>3</sup> 1885, II.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum*, s.v.

<sup>5</sup> 'Hulled' grains in modern terminology are those whose rachis breaks during threshing before the grains can be freed from the closely fitting cover glumes. These include most barleys

and the 'hulled' wheats, such as emmer (*Triticum dicoccum* Schübler) and spelt (*Triticum spelta* L.). The common and durum wheats (*T. vulgare* Host and *T. durum* Desfontaines) are 'naked'; i.e. their rachis is sufficiently tough, and their cover glumes sufficiently loose, to allow the grain to be freed from its hulls during threshing. It seems certain that πυρός was 'naked' wheat, and that ζεία and δλυρα were 'hulled' wheats, but their exact identification in terms of modern botany is one of the most difficult problems in this field.

<sup>6</sup> See *O.E.D.*

The Homeric 'plant' names—*κριθή* (*κρι*), *πυρός*, *ζειά*, *δλυρα*<sup>1</sup>—are used both for grain growing in the field<sup>2</sup> and for grain fed to animals, especially horses:<sup>3</sup> *ζειά* and *δλυρα* are never mentioned in connexion with human food, and *κρι* and *πυρός* only in one passage each.<sup>4</sup> From this it has been inferred<sup>5</sup> that *ζειά* and *δλυρα* were not used as human food, while *πυρός* became so used only in the course of the Homeric age, especially since all the 'product' names usually associated with wheat are found only in the *Odyssey*.<sup>6</sup> *Κριθή*, for the reasons set out below, has been connected with *ἄλφειον*, which is consequently described as a product from it.

From this connexion it has further been commonly concluded that barley was the staple human cereal food of the Homeric age. Yet all the evidence goes to show that, while barley may have been important, wheat was regarded as the most valuable cereal for human food. The Homeric text frequently refers to the growing of wheat: sometimes, but by no means always, barley is also mentioned, but if so it always takes second place. Only twice<sup>7</sup> is barley mentioned apart from wheat, once in a simile, and once where its absence at a sacrifice is related. If some of the adjectives—*πολύπυρος*, *πυρηφόρος*, *πυροφόρος*—which have been taken<sup>8</sup> to prove the presence of wheat in a particular district are in reality no more than constant epithets, like the common *ζειδαῖος* (*ἄρουρα*),<sup>9</sup> the fact that these constant epithets are always connected with wheat and never with barley is itself evidence in favour of the preponderance of wheat in Homer's world. The excavations at Troy, moreover, have brought to light carbonized wheat grain 'by the bushel' in various places of storage, while barley surprised the investigators by its absence.<sup>10</sup>

The earliest evidence for a connexion between *ἄλφειτα* and barley is Plat. *Rep.* 2. 372b: *ἐκ μὲν τῶν κριθῶν ἄλφειτα σκευαζόμενοι, ἐκ δὲ τῶν πυρῶν ἄλευρα*, a passage which shows that *ἄλφειον* in the early fourth century B.C. was commonly made from barley. A similar connexion next appears in Aristotle's *Problemata*,<sup>11</sup> and becomes common in later writers, such as Galen,<sup>12</sup> until the lexicographers eventually included *κριθή* in the definition of *ἄλφειον*.

The etymology of the word is usually supposed to support the accepted translation. *Ἀλφειον* is usually<sup>13</sup> connected with the stem of *albus*,<sup>14</sup> which agrees well with the common Homeric *κρι λευκόν*: indeed, *ἄλφειτα λευκά* is itself found.<sup>15</sup> But quite apart

<sup>1</sup> I am here assuming (with Hdt. 2. 36) that *ζειά* and *δλυρα* were identical or, at any rate, that the poet made no distinction between them. Each of these words is, incidentally, confined to one only of the Homeric epics, though *ζειδαῖος* (for which cf. Plin. *H.N.* 18. 82) occurs in both.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. references in Heichelheim's article on *σίτος* in Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl. vi, col. 826 f., to which may be added *Il.* 11. 756 (Buprasion), *Od.* 16. 396, 19. 292 (Dulichion), *Il.* 12. 314 (Xanthus plain), and references to the island of Syrie (*Od.* 15. 406) and the country of the Cyclopes (*Od.* 9. 110); cf. also *Il.* 11. 69; *Od.* 19. 112.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. *Il.* 5. 196, 8. 188, *Od.* 4. 41; but also geese (*Od.* 19. 536, 553).

<sup>4</sup> *Od.* 12. 358: *οὐ γὰρ ἔχον κρι λευκὸν εἰσσεῖλμον ἐπὶ νηός*, and 20. 108-9: *ἄλφειτα τεύχουσαι καὶ ἀλείατα, μυελὸν ἀνδρῶν. . . ἐπεὶ κατὰ πυρὸν ἄλεσσαν*. These passages, especially the second, show clearly that the raw material awaiting preparation is meant.

<sup>5</sup> Cf., for example, almost any dictionary article on these words. <sup>6</sup> Cf. below, p. 116, n. 2.

<sup>7</sup> *Od.* 12. 358 (above, n. 4); *Il.* 20. 496.

<sup>8</sup> e.g. by Heichelheim (loc. cit.).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. above, n. 1 (the use of *ζειδαῖος* has not here—or by Heichelheim—been taken to prove the presence of wheat).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Schliemann, *Ilios* (London, 1880), p. 320; Wittmack, 'Samen aus den Ruinen von Hissarlik' (*Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*, 1890, pp. 614 ff.); Virchow, *Beiträge zur Landeskunde der Troas* (Aus den Abhandlungen der kgl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1879), pp. 68 ff., 186.

<sup>11</sup> 1. 37, with which cf. *ibid.* 21. 24, 38. 10.

<sup>12</sup> Ed. Kühn, vol. vi, p. 506: *ἐκ τῶν νέων κριθῶν φρυγιστὸν συμμέτρως τὸ κάλλιστον ἄλφειον γίνεται. τούτων δὲ ἀποροῦντες ἐπίστε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων (sc. κριθῶν) αὐτὰ σκευάζουσιν*; cf. Dioscorides, *M.M.* 2. 108 (for which see below).

<sup>13</sup> So, for example, G. Curtius, *Principles of Greek Etymology*<sup>3</sup> (London, 1886), § 399.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. in Greek *ἀλφός* (e.g. Plat. *Tim.* 85a), *ἀλφοτρόσσωπος* and *ἀλφόρυγχος* (*Hippiatr.* 13).

<sup>15</sup> *Il.* 11. 640, 18. 560; *Od.* 10. 520, 11. 28, 14. 77.



from the fact that whiteness has long been regarded as a characteristic of good grain products,<sup>1</sup> the combination ἄλφιτα λευκά suggests that the writer at any rate was not conscious of an etymology which would make the phrase tautologous.

Boisacq<sup>2</sup> follows G. Meyer<sup>3</sup> in connecting ἄλφιτον with the Albanian *ërp-bi*, which Meyer translates as 'barley'. But even if the Albanian meaning is certain—which cannot here be decided—the connexion with *albus* could still stand, giving the word the meaning of 'white grain product'; and this need not in Greek have been restricted to any particular grain. Indeed, the commonly accepted connexion between 'wheat' and 'white'<sup>4</sup> shows that 'white grain' does not invariably mean barley.

It seems also possible, however, that the word is connected with the stem of ἄλφάνω and ἀλφησιός. Liddell and Scott follow Bergk, Lentz, L. Meyer, etc.,<sup>5</sup> in referring the word ἀλφησιός to ἄλφάνω and translating it as 'enterprising' (lit. 'earner'), while K. F. Hermann and others compare the Homeric ἄνδρες ἀλφησιαι *de toto hominum genere*<sup>6</sup> with ἀρούρης καρπὸν ἔδοντες<sup>7</sup> and ἄλφιτα, μυελὸς ἀνδρῶν<sup>8</sup> and derive the word from ἄλφι<sup>9</sup> and ἔδω, translating it as *qui pane vescitur*. If, instead of supposing that two only of the three words are connected, we assume a connexion between all three, ἄλφιτα may well originally be that which men earn by their labour in a very general sense. This suggestion would be particularly plausible if Curtius's<sup>10</sup> derivation of ἄλφάνω from the root of the Sanskrit *rabh-* (German *Arb-eit*) is correct. But although this derivation would most obviously support the view here put forward, I hope to have shown that neither of the other suggested derivations is incompatible with this view.

The accepted interpretation of the word ἄλφιτα contrasts it with ἄλευρα (Hom. ἀλείατα), which is taken to mean 'wheat flour'.<sup>11</sup> This contrast, again, first appears in Plat. *Rep.*, loc. cit. Now it is abundantly clear that ἄλευρα and ἀλείατα were so called from the method of preparation,<sup>12</sup> and it was common for cereal foods to be named in this way. The μάζα, for instance, was obviously named from the kneading process by which it was made,<sup>13</sup> just as κυκεών is obviously derived from κυκάω.<sup>14</sup> This fact alone makes it likely that the contrast between ἄλφιτα and ἄλευρα lay in the method of manufacture rather than in the material used, and one of the passages quoted from the *Odyssey*<sup>15</sup> certainly suggests—though it cannot by itself be conclusive—that both were made from πυρός.

The assumption that ἄλφιτον was necessarily made from barley would, moreover, lead to the paradoxical conclusion that while at the time of the *Iliad* both wheat and barley were grown, and both are mentioned as food for horses,<sup>16</sup> only that which in the common opinion of antiquity was regarded as the less valuable of the two for human

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gal. vi. 504 K.: κάλλισται δὲ εἰσιν αἱ λευκαὶ μετὰ τὸ πιεσθῆναι φαινόμεναι (sc. κριθαί) with common modern valuations of flour and e.g. Juvenal 5. 70f.: 'tener et niveus mollique siligine factus servatur domino'.

<sup>2</sup> *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, s.v.

<sup>3</sup> *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der albanesischen Sprache*, p. 94.

<sup>4</sup> Goth. *hwait-i* and *hveit-s*; Germ. *Weizen* and *weiss*; cf., for example, Curtius, loc. cit.

<sup>5</sup> References for both this and Hermann's view are given by Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum*, s.v. ἀλφησιός.

<sup>6</sup> e.g. *Od.* i. 349, 13. 261.

<sup>7</sup> e.g. *Il.* 6. 142.

<sup>8</sup> e.g. *Od.* 2. 290.

<sup>9</sup> = ἄλφιτον, *h. Cer.* 208.

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, § 398.

<sup>11</sup> So, for example, Liddell and Scott, cf. Eust. 1885. 11, quoted p. 113.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Od.* 20. 108-9 (above, p. 114, n. 4), and *ἀλετρις*, ib. 105; *ἀλετρεύω*, ib. 7. 104.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Plat. *Rep.* 2. 372b, Hipp. *Acut.* 37, and esp. Hdt. i. 200: καὶ ὅς μὲν ἂν βούληται αὐτῶν ἄτε μάζαν μαζάμενος ἔδει, ὁ δὲ ἄρτου τρόπον ὀπτήσας (referring to fish), which suggests a difference between μάζα and ἄρτος analogous to that here suggested for ἄλφιτα and ἄλευρα.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. esp. *Od.* 10. 235 and 290; perhaps also ἄρτος, if cognate with ἀραρίσκω, though the ancients were certainly unaware of this connexion.

<sup>15</sup> 20. 108-9 (above, p. 114, n. 4); Monro (ad loc.) notices this, but he too feels compelled by Plat. *Rep.*, loc. cit. to assume that ἄλφιτα in Homer necessarily implies barley.

<sup>16</sup> For references see above, p. 114, nn. 2 and 3.

food<sup>1</sup> was eaten by man, since all the names for cereal products which are usually associated with wheat are found only in the *Odyssey*,<sup>2</sup> while ἄλφιτα, the most common of these 'product' names, occurs in both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.<sup>3</sup> This difficulty disappears as soon as the difference between the 'plant' names and those of prepared products is recognized, and if it is admitted that the latter refer primarily to a method of preparation.

The most conclusive positive evidence, however, for the view here put forward is the occurrence in post-Homeric Greek<sup>4</sup> of such phrases as ἄλφιτα πύρινα,<sup>5</sup> ἄλφιτα φακῶν καὶ ὀρόβων,<sup>6</sup> and ἄλφιτα λίθοιο,<sup>7</sup> which according to the accepted interpretation would be as self-contradictory as the ἄλευρον made from κριθή which is mentioned by Dioscorides<sup>8</sup> side by side with ἄλφιτον.

It is suggested therefore that the difference between ἄλφιτα and ἄλευρα was essentially one between different production processes. The precise nature of this difference must be the subject of a separate and very much larger study than this,<sup>9</sup> but a tentative suggestion can perhaps here be made about the type of difference for which we must look.

If the connexion between οὐλαί and οὐλος = ὄλος is correct, in which the ancient lexicographers believed,<sup>10</sup> the difference between οὐλαί and ἄλφιτα may well have been that between grain that was freed from its hulls but not ground at all and grain that was roughly crushed. This suggestion is supported by the use of ἀκτῆ with ἄλφιτα,<sup>11</sup> if the common derivation of this word<sup>12</sup> from ἀγνύναι 'to crush' is correct. The difference between ἄλφιτα and ἄλευρα was, then, probably that between groats and either meal or flour.

If this general view is true, the more advanced technique which produced ἄλευρα, and which probably first appeared in the course of the Homeric age, was found in the course of time particularly suitable for wheat, just as nowadays, too, barley groats are quite common, while wheat is usually ground into flour. By Plato's time the association of ἄλφιτα and ἄλευρα with barley and wheat respectively had then become sufficiently constant for groats from material other than barley to be called ἄλφιτα πύρινα, etc., much as we now speak of wheat groats: ἄλφιτα by itself appears by then to have come to mean barley groats.

These considerations would seem to lead to a threefold conclusion. In Homeric translations of ἄλφιτα no particular cereal should be mentioned and, subject to further investigation of the differences in production technique, 'groats' would appear to be the most adequate—if not a very poetic—translation of the word.

<sup>1</sup> Cf., for example, Diosc. *M.M.* 2. 108, Gal. vi. 507 K.

<sup>2</sup> ἄρτος (17. 343, 18. 120), ἀλείατα (20. 108), πύρνος or πύρνον (15. 312, 17. 12, 362), the last being the only Homeric example of a 'product' name etymologically connected with a 'plant' name.

<sup>3</sup> Three times in the *Iliad* (11. 631, 640; 18. 560) and twelve times in the *Odyssey* (2. 290, 354, 355, 380; 10. 234, 520; 11. 28; 14. 77, 429; 19. 197; 20. 108, 119) according to Gehring's *Index Homericus*.

<sup>4</sup> Liddell and Scott, in noting this usage (like (*E.M.*, loc. cit.), give 'groats generally' as a secondary meaning of ἄλφιτον: it is the main contention of this note that 'groats generally' is the primary meaning of the word.

<sup>5</sup> Hipp. *Acut.* (*Sp.*) 53. <sup>6</sup> Id. *Int.* 23.

<sup>7</sup> Orph. *Lith.* 212.

<sup>8</sup> *M.M.* 2. 108, cf. Gal. vi. 474 K., Plut. *Mor.*

397a, and e.g. κριθῖνοι ἄρτοι (e.g. Gal. vi. 504 K.).

<sup>9</sup> I hope shortly to be able to be more precise on what this difference was and to discuss in detail also the nature of the μάζα (always closely connected with ἄλφιτα), which, according to Athen. 4. 137e, stood in the same relation to ἄρτος in Solonic Athens as does bread to cake nowadays (cf. above, p. 115, n. 13, and esp. Jardé, op. cit., pp. 123-4 and notes).

<sup>10</sup> e.g. Suid. s.v. οὐλοθυεῖν: . . . οὐλὰς γὰρ ἔλεγον τὰς κριθὰς κατὰ ἀντίθεσιν τῶν ψαυστῶν . . . καὶ τὰς μὲν κριθὰς μέχρι νῦν ἔλας χέουσιν οἱ ἐπιθόντες ταῖς σπονδαῖς . . .; cf. Ebeling, *Lex. Hom.*, s.v. οὐλαί.

<sup>11</sup> e.g. *Il.* 11. 631; *Od.* 2. 355, 14. 429.

<sup>12</sup> e.g. Ebeling, s.v. The use of μολύβδος in this connexion helps little, since the meaning of this word is too uncertain (cf. Plut. *Q. Rom.* 109).

From this it follows, secondly, that while the evidence shows that barley and wheat were both much grown, the frequent occurrence of the word ἄλφιτα in Homer does not mean that barley was more common than other cereals as human food. Nor is there any reason to suppose that ζεία and ὄλυρα were not eaten by human beings then as they still were centuries later<sup>1</sup> and still are in some places<sup>2</sup> in spite of the obvious advantages of 'naked' over hulled wheats.

Lastly, the ἄλφιτα to which Aristophanes<sup>3</sup> refers figuratively as the 'daily bread' of his contemporaries should not be regarded as necessarily made of barley unless external evidence supports this interpretation,<sup>4</sup> though by then ἄλφιτα, at least in its literal sense, had probably acquired its secondary meaning of 'barley groats'.<sup>5</sup>

L. A. MORITZ.

MERTON COLLEGE,  
OXFORD.

# ADDENDUM

After this note had been completed I became aware of a passage in Galen's τοῦ Ἱπποκράτους γλωσσῶν ἐξηγήσεις<sup>6</sup> which has a strong bearing on my argument: ἄλφιτα οὐ μόνον τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν κριθῶν οὕτως καλεῖται· ἐν τε γὰρ τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν γυναικείων ἄλφιτα πύρινα εἴρηται· ἐν δὲ τῷ περὶ νοῦσων δευτέρῳ τῷ μείζονι καὶ φακῶν καὶ ὀρόβων πεφρυγμένων· ἄλφιτα τοίνυν παντὸς ἀληθεσμένου καρποῦ τὸ σύμμετρον τῷ μεγέθει θραῦμα ὀνομάζεται. τὰ μὲν γὰρ μείζω κρίμνα, τὰ δὲ ἐλάττω ἄλευρα.

I need hardly emphasize the support which the suggestions made in my note derive from this passage, but I would draw attention to a rather less obvious point. Galen's own usage, both in the passages quoted earlier and elsewhere,<sup>7</sup> reflects the fact that ἄλφιτον for him and his contemporaries was 'barley groats'. His comments on ἄλφιτα πύρινα, etc., in the present passage are very much the same as those of Liddell and Scott<sup>8</sup> and other modern lexicographers. But while for Galen's purposes it was unimportant which was the primary and which the secondary meaning, I hope to have shown that far-reaching mistakes can result and have resulted if students of a wider field than Galen's fail to define the primary meaning of the word correctly.

<sup>1</sup> Cf., for example, Plin. *H.N.* 18. 81 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf., for example, A. Schulz, *Geschichte der kultivierten Getreide* (Halle, 1913), pp. 38 ff.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. *Plut.* 219, *Nub.* 106.

<sup>4</sup> Especially as figurative uses tend to lag behind actual practice: straw, for instance, is no longer essential for making bricks.

<sup>5</sup> This article is connected with a study on Milling and Breadmaking in Classical Antiquity which is being undertaken for the National Association of British and Irish Millers, to whom I am indebted for permission to publish it. I am grateful also to Dr. G. E. F. Chilver of The Queen's College, to Messrs. R. G. C. Levens and K. J. Maidment of Merton, and to the Editors of

the *C.Q.* for some valuable suggestions after reading the article in manuscript.

On the general subject of cereals in the Graeco-Roman world see N. Jasny, *The Wheats of Classical Antiquity* (1944), and id., 'Competition among Grains in Classical Antiquity', in *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, 1941-2, pp. 747 ff.

<sup>6</sup> xix. 76 K.

<sup>7</sup> Cf., for example, his definition, in another work, of the κρίμνα contrasted with ἄλφιτα in the present passage (xviii B. 151 K.: κρίμνα καλεῖται τὰ τοῖς ἀλφίτοις ἐμφερόμενα τῆς πεφρυγμένης κριθῆς μόρια μεγάλα, διαπεφυγόντα δηλονότι τὴν ἐν τῇ μύλῃ κατεργασίαν ἀκριβῆ).

<sup>8</sup> See above, p. 116, n. 4.



## INTERPRETATIONES PROPERTIANAE

1. 2. 9 ff.      aspice quos submittat humus formosa colores,  
                          ut ueniant hederæ sponte sua melius,  
                          surgat et in solis formosius arbutus antris,  
                          et sciat indociles currere lympha uias.  
                          litora natiuis persuadent picta lapillis,  
                          et uolucres nulla dulcius arte canunt.

THE amount of criticism heaped upon *persuadent* (13) has obscured consideration of the meaning of *picta*; for it is this word which carries the weight of the line. Tracing the sequence of thought in the passage will show where the emphasis lies. There is throughout a comparison, either expressed (*melius* 10, *formosius* 11, *dulcius* 14), or implied (9 and 12), between the artless manifestations of nature and their cultivated, trained, or man-made counterparts; 'wild flowers are more beautiful to behold than cultivated ones; similarly ivy and arbutus which grow as they will are more attractive than those in gardens; natural rills more charming than artificial fountains, . . . birds which sing from the heart delight us more than those which have been taught.'

A like antithesis should exist in l. 13, between the natural pebbles on the shore and something similar made by man. The key is to be found in Statius, *Silvae*, 1. 3. 55 f. 'uarias ubi picta per artes | gaudet humus, superatque nouis asarota figuris', where *picta* is used of a floor-mosaic<sup>1</sup> and gives for our passage the required meaning. *picta lapillis* is simply 'mosaicked'; and l. 13 thus points the greater attraction of Nature's mosaic formed by the pebbles on the shore, as compared with man's inferior attempt to copy her in making floor-mosaics. Translate 'the sea-shore, mosaicked with natural pebbles, has a charm for us (sc. greater than that of mosaics made by human hand)'.

It may be objected that there is no comparative word in 13, but the whole tenor of the passage is one of comparison; Propertius frequently expects the reader to fill out such ellipses for himself. The rhythmical arrangement of the comparisons should be noted: the passage divides into two groups of one and two couplets, as follows: (i) comparison implied in 9, expressed in 10; and (ii) comparison expressed in 11, implied in 12 and 13, expressed in 14; giving an order *a-b*; *b-a*, *a-b*.

1. 2. 25 f.      non ego nunc uereor ne sim tibi uilior istis:  
                          uni si qua placet, culta puella sat est.

These lines have perplexed all editors. It has generally been assumed that *istis* is feminine, and ablative of comparison with *uilior*. Enk saw that it might be neuter, but missed the point. If we take *istis* as neuter, and ablative of instrument, the passage becomes clear at once. It means 'because of what I have just said', referring in a general way to the rather harsh remarks previously made. For this use of *iste* cf. Prop. 2. 6. 33 'non istis olim uariabant tecta figuris', 'drawings such as I have described'; 2. 8. 27 'quamuis ista mihi mors est inhonesta futura', 'such a death as I have described', i.e. murder; 3. 7. 30 'ista per humanas mors uenit acta manus', 'such a death as I have described', i.e. by drowning; 1. 9. 13, 2. 24. 15, 3. 11. 7, 3. 25. 5; Catullus 10. 28 'istud quod modo dixeram' (fully expressed); and (an exact parallel), Statius, *Silvae*, 2. 1. 226 'nil flecteris istis?', 'are you not moved by what I have just said?'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For this use of *pingere*, *pictura*, and cognate words, see my article in *C.R.* vol. lxi, No. 2, p. 47, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> For other neuter pronouns used in oblique

cases to refer generally to the preceding subject-matter, cf. Prop. 1. 15. 41 *quis*, 2. 17. 3 *horum*, 3. 2. 23 *illis*.

The force of *nunc* should not be pressed too strongly.<sup>1</sup> The phrase has a colloquial flavour, and means 'I do not in the present case fear—(sc. however much I might fear in other circumstances)'; so also in 1. 6. 1 'non ego nunc Hadriae uereor mare noscere tecum', 'I do not fear a voyage in the present (supposed) case, that is, in your company (sc. however much I might fear with others)', and 1. 19. 1 'non ego nunc tristes uereor, mea Cynthia, Manes', 'I do not fear death in the present (supposed) case, that is, if you attend my funeral (sc. however much I might fear death without your presence)'. Compare also *tum* = 'in that case', 1. 5. 27.

Note also that *uilis tibi sum* is Propertius' way of expressing, in an introverted fashion, 'I have incurred your displeasure'; cf. 2. 14. 12 'sicco uilior lacu' and 1. 8. 2 'an tibi sum gelida uilior Illyria?' (Ovid, *Her.* 12. 187 'si tibi sum uilis').

The sense, then, is 'I have been saying some harsh things to you, Cynthia (19–24); you have a right to be angry with me; but in the present case I am not afraid that I shall incur your displeasure because of what I have just said; I have compliments to pay also.' The compliments are to be found in ll. 26–30, while 31–2 make clear to Cynthia that the rebuke nevertheless stands.

1. 9. 23–4. nullus amor cuiquam faciles ita praebuit alas,  
ut non alterna presserit ille manu.

*praebet habenas* Jacobs: *uice* Barber.

The emendations here noted are sufficient hint of the difficulties latent in this couplet, which each editor has interpreted in his own way. Reference to the notes of Postgate, Butler-Barber, and Enk shows clearly that no final solution has been reached; the explanations given are too subtle and involved to be readily suggested by Propertius' words as they stand.

The ideas here derive from the myth in the *Phaedrus* of Plato (246 E ff.), which describes the manner in which the soul grows wings, and in particular how the lover's soul becomes winged; but, as the application is on a lower plane, they have been dressed in the garb of a well-known *locus*, namely, the story of Icarus and Daedalus.

The general sense is sufficiently clear; the lover soars at times aloft on the wings of happiness and confidence, but he must fall to the ground; love is not a constant thing. In Plato's view, this is because the lover's soul is not perfect, though first among the less perfect (see 248 A–C). Plato then proceeds to develop this theme as it affects the lover; when he falls in love, he is like a fledgeling attempting to fly, but without much success; his wings grow at the sight of the loved one, watered, as it were, by the stream of *ἔμπερος* passing through the eyes (cf. Prop. 1. 1. 1; 2. 15. 12; 2. 32. 1–2; 3. 10. 15; 3. 21. 3; 4. 8. 65), but wilt when the loved one is away (249 D–251 C).

As I have remarked, Propertius has remodelled such ideas as these on the lines of the Daedalus-story, a well-known commonplace. To accustom the reader to the allusive manner in which the *locus* is introduced, he prefaces it with several other such allusions; we have in 16 an oblique reference to Tantalus, and in 20 to Ixion, while he rounds off at 31 with an allusion to the Orpheus-Eurydice myth.

The story of Icarus' happy soaring aloft on the wings made for him by Daedalus is often told (Ov. *Met.* 8. 183–235, *A.A.* 2. 43 ff., Virg. *Aen.* 6. 14 ff., Sil. It. 12. 89 ff.), and became a topic to illustrate the theme 'pride goes before a fall' (Ov. *Trist.* 1. 1. 87–90, Hor. *Od.* 2. 20. 13, 4. 2. 1, Sen. *Oed.* 900 ff., *Herc. Oet.* 675–92, Lucian, *Imag.* 21, *et al.*); thence it became almost proverbial to express extreme daring (Hor. *Od.* 1. 3. 34). Closely allied hereto is the metaphorical use of *pinnae* to express unbounded confidence, which is found in Cic. *ad Att.* 4. 2. 5 'illi qui mihi pinnas inciderant nolunt

<sup>1</sup> 'nunc nullam habere ἔμπερον in hac uerborum iunctura' (Enk).

easdem renasci; sed, ut spero, iam renascuntur'; Hor. *Épp.* 2. 2. 50 'decisis humilis pinnis', with the opposite expression id. ib. 1. 20. 21 'extendere pinnas'. Here belongs Prop. 3. 10. 11 'tuque o cara mihi felicibus edita pinnis | surge', 'soaring aloft on the wings of happiness', not, as B.-B., 'born under happy omen' (for *edita* cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1. 3. 110 'uiribus editor'). This use is blended with the Icarus-story in Ovid, *Trist.* 3. 8. 6-16. There the poet begs Augustus to permit his return from exile, saying (6 f.) 'nunc ego iactandas optarem sumere pinnas, siue tuas Perseu, Daedale siue tuas'; and later (15 f.) 'ille tibi pinnasque potest currusque uolucres | tradere; det reditum, protinus ales eris'.<sup>1</sup> In other words, Augustus can grant the power to travel, as Daedalus granted it to Icarus, and can also fill the recipient with unbounded confidence.

The wings of love are not usually regarded as detachable (as are those of Icarus: see Ov. *Met.* 8. 209, 9. 743, Virgil, l.c., Hor. *Od.* 4. 2. 2, Mart. 4. 59. 5, Juv. 3. 25, Sil. It. 12. 103); but as tending to such a view may be quoted Seruius on *Aen.* 1. 689 '[alas exiit Amor] siquidem Cupido alis tantum depositis Ascanius fuit' and *A.P.* 5. 268 ἀστεμφής ἀδόνητος ἐνέζεται, οὐδὲ μετέστη | εἰς ἐμὲ κειράμενος συζυγίην πτερίγων (for which cf. also Prop. 2. 12. 14): 'nor has he changed his abode; for he has sheared off and given to me the twin structure of his wings'. (Whether this is a reminiscence of Propertius, a deliberate imitation, or a descendant from the same rhetorical source, would be difficult to determine: I prefer the last.) A fragment (Grenfell-Hunt, *P. Oxy.* ii. 1899, No. 220, p. 45, Plate vi πτερά δ' ἀγὰ παρ' Ἐρωτος Ἀφροδίτα, 'Aphrodite, holy wings from the hands of Love') is too brief to be good evidence, but may well fit this type of context.

The meaning of *praeuit alas* is clear; the phrase recurs in Ovid, *Met.* 12. 604, where Memnon's ashes fly aloft from the funeral pyre ('leuitas sua praeuit alas'), and is imitated by Claudian, 8. 558 'ipse tibi famulas praeberet Pegasus alas'. It means simply 'to give those wings which are his own attribute', and *manu* in the pentameter reflects back on it to give the sense 'hands over'.<sup>2</sup>

To sum up so far, Love is considered as a Daedalus, giving wings to the lover, as to Icarus. The significance of the wings has been illustrated from the *Phaedrus* in the erotic sense, and from Horace, Cicero, and Ovid as the source of free, unbounded confidence and elation. Like Icarus, the lover cannot remain aloft; his happiness is excessive, and he must fall. That this is the sense of the pentameter is certain; but there is difficulty both in *presserit* and in *allerna manu*.

The meaning assigned to *presserit* will differ, according as we take its object to be *amatorem* (understood from *cuiquam* foreg.), or *alas*. In the first case, it will mean 'to dash down'; for this sense parallels are hard to find, but if we take the basic meaning as 'to put down from a higher to a lower level', Ovid, *Am.* 2. 11. 5 'o utinam, ne quis remo freta longa moueret, | Argo funestas pressa bibisset aquas' may be quoted. In the second case, it will mean 'to close', as in Ennius, Trag. 357 '[galli] plausu premunt alas' and Stat. *Theb.* 10. 91 'pressis Silentia pinnis'. As either action would cause a flying bird-man to fall, Propertius may have deliberately left the meaning an open question, allowing us to understand whichever sense we please.

*Allerna manu* is taken by Enk, following Prinz, in its usual sense of 'modo laeua, modo dextera'; this would yield a reasonable interpretation, i.e. that Love elates the

<sup>1</sup> The chariot is that of Fortune; it is here mentioned with Icarus, as in Lucian, l.c. ἐπειδὴν γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἡ τύχη μὴδὲν τοιοῦτον ἐπίσταντας ἀφνω ἀναβιβάζει εἰς πτηνὸν τι καὶ μετάρσιον ὄχημα . . . ὥσπερ ὁ Ἰκαρος γέλωτα ὀφλισκάνουσι εἰς πελάγη . . . ἐμπίπτοντες. Compare also the anonymous Hymn to Fortune in Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* 196 (3rd cent. A.D.): τὰ μὲν ὑψίστη καὶ

σεμνὰ εἰς τεὸν ὄμμα ὑπήρικας ποτὶ γῆν . . . τὰ δὲ φαῖλα καὶ ταπεινὰ πολλὰκίς πτεροῖς εἰς ὕψος ἐξείρας. The idea seems to derive from the winged chariot of Medea, Eur. *Med.* 1122-3.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Longus, 2. 7. 1: θεὸς ἐστίν, ὦ παῖδες, ὁ Ἔρως νέος καὶ καλὸς καὶ πετόμενος διὰ τοῦτο καὶ νεότητι χαίρει καὶ κάλλος διώκει καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἀναπτεροῖ.



over, only to dash him down, and then repeats the process. Seeing that a single, not a repeated, sequence is meant, Barber altered *manu* to *uice* 'in turn', but this is unnecessary: the meaning can be got from the words as they are. Compare Stat. *Theb.* 2. 182 f. 'quas Doricus alligat undis | Isthmos, et alterna quas margine summouet infra', where, as here, *alternus* is used of two equal and opposite aspects of the same action or intent, which are mutually exclusive in that they cannot occur simultaneously. Somewhat similar is Statius, *Silu.* 3. 3. 49 f. 'uice cuncta reguntur | alternisque premunt', where *alternis* means merely 'in turn' rather than 'turn and turn about'.

Propertius' use of *manu* is frequently unemphatic, but never quite otiose; when it appears so to be, attention is nevertheless always drawn to the fact that the action of the verb is performed by the hand; compare for this weakened use 1. 16. 44 'occultis manibus' almost, but not quite, = 'secretly'; 3. 22. 8 'secta Persea Phorcidos ora manu' almost = 'by Perseus'; 3. 25. 10 'irata manu' almost = 'angrily'; 4. 2. 26 'nostra gramina secta manu' almost = 'by me'; 4. 6. 22 'pila feminea turpiter acta manu' almost = 'by a woman'. As mentioned, *manu* also reflects back on *praebuilt*, and makes its meaning more definite. It must not therefore be changed; there is no difficulty in taking the phrase to mean 'in turn'.

Thus the sense is: 'never did Love hand over his wings to any man to be easily plied, without dashing him down in turn (or, with the other hand)'. The passage has now been reduced to a form similar to that of 2. 8. 7 f. 'omnia uertuntur: certe uertuntur amores; | uinceris aut uincis, haec in amore rota est' and 2. 18. 21 f. 'saepe Cupido | huic malus esse solet, cui bonus ante fuit'.

(If it should be objected that the whole procedure is so odd as to be incredible, I would point out that Love performs some even more peculiar actions at 2. 30. 7 ff.:

instat semper Amor supra caput, instat amanti,  
et grauis ipse super libera colla sedet.  
excubat ille acer custos, et tollere numquam  
te patietur humo lumina capta semel.)

For the references to Cicero, *ad Att.* 4. 2. 5 and Stat. *Theb.* 2. 183, I am indebted to Mr. D. R. Shackleton Bailey.

1. 18. 17 f. an quia parua damus mutato signa colore,  
et non ulla meo clamat in ore fides?

colore O: calore A1, P, D2, V2.

Here editors have missed the point: Butler remarks 'Two interpretations are possible: (1) "is it that I show few (*sic*) outward signs of love, and no longer flush at sight of you?" (2) "is it that I am no longer pale with longing for you, and show few outward signs of love?" But the phrase is vague, and *calore v* may be right: "is it that my passion's fire has cooled, and I show, etc.?"'. B.-B. are content with 'i.e. "I neither flush nor turn pale for love of you"; cp. 1. 15. 39.' Enk follows Prinz in rejecting Rothstein's *signa* = 'Liebeszeichen', and reads *calore*.

The words are not in the least vague, however; in the hexameter there is a mixed metaphor, partly medical, partly drawn from the atmosphere of the law-courts; this mixture blends in, and, as it were, radiates outwards from, the words *mutato colore*. The pentameter contains a modification of a legal phrase.

Such phrases as *mutare colorem* (-es), *mutatio coloris*, describe, not so much the indication of any one positive emotion, such as love, as the outward signs of mental or emotional confusion, particularly of a person indicted in a court of law, or of one accused of some misdemeanour or inadequacy, or of one confuted in argument.

Compare Cicero, *pro Clu.* 19. 54 'timor eius, perturbatio, suspensus incertusque uultus, crebra coloris mutatio, quae erant antea suspiciosa, haec aperta et manifesta faciebant'; Hor. *Epiph.* 1. 16. 38 f. 'idem si clamet furem, neget esse pudicum, contendat laqueo collum pressisse patrum, mordere opprobriis falsis mutemque colores?' Ter. *Andr.* 878 f. 'num cogitat quid dicat? num facti piget? uide num eius color pudoris signum usque indicat'; Aul. Gell. *Noct. Att.* 15. 9. 10 'sed cum homo uultum intorqueret et non hisceret' ('was unable to find an answer') 'et colores mutaret, tum ego intercessi'; Lucian, *Eun.* 11 (358) τούτων δὴ λεγομένων παρὰ πάντων μὲν γέλως ἐγγίγντο, ὥς τὸ εἰκός. Βαγίας δὲ μᾶλλον ἐταράττετο καὶ παντοῖος ἦν ἐς μυρία τραπόμενος χρώματα καὶ ψυχρῶ τῷ ἰδρωτὶ ρέόμενος, καὶ οὔτε συγκατατίθεσθαι τῷ περὶ τῆς μοιχείας ἐγκλήματι καλῶς ἔχειν ᾤετο οὔτε ἀχρεῖον αὐτῷ τὴν κατηγορίαν ταύτην ἐς τὸν παρόντα ἀγῶνα ἡγεῖτο εἶναι (see also Livy, 39. 34. 7 'adeo perturbauit ea uox regem ut non color non uultus ei constaret'; Virg. *Aen.* 6. 46-9; and, where the emotion causing the colour-change is definitely stated, Plato, *Lysis* 222B ὑπὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς παντοδαπὰ ἡφίει χρώματα, Aristaeetus 1. 11 ὑφ' ἡδονῆς παντοδαπὰ χρώματα παρ' ἑκαστον λόγον ὑφίει).

In the hexameter, then, Propertius speaks of himself as if arraigned before Cynthia on some ill-defined charge (e.g. of indifference or disloyalty), and asks whether she is displeased that he does not show the expected emotional reactions.<sup>1</sup>

But this is not the end of the matter. *Mutato colore* also suggests the symptoms of an illness, which enables *parua signa dare* to be explained. For the medical use of *signa* = 'symptoms', cf. Virg. *Geo.* 4. 251 ff. 'si uero, quoniam casus apibus quoque nostris | uita tulit, tristi languescunt corpora morbo— | quod iam non dubiis poteris cognoscere signis— | continuo est aegris alius color', Prop. 3. 8. 9, Ov. *Am.* 1. 11. 12, *Rem. Am.* 510. *Dare signa* 'to display symptoms', is found in Virg. *Geo.* 3. 503 'haec ante exitium primis dant signa diebus'; and, with a defining genitive, in Lucretius 6. 1182 'multaque praeterea mortis tum signa dabantur'.

*Parua* is emphatic ('only slight signs'); it contains an implied negative which is strongly felt, and may be paraphrased *minimi momenti*, i.e. *non maximi momenti*, and is further explained by the pentameter. That the adjective is not inadequate is clear from Virg. *Aen.* 3. 685 'inter utramque uiam leti discrimine paruo' and Ovid, *Her.* 19. 15-16 'quique fuit numquam paruus . . . creuit amor'.

To deal next with the pentameter: *clamat fides* is a striking and unusual phrase. An exact parallel is found in *Edict. Imp. Diocl.* praef. 13 'quantum . . . ipsarum rerum fides clamat'; a converse expression, *tacita fides*, is found several times in the Jurisconsults: cf. Marcell. *Dig.* 30. 123. 1 'si in fraudem legum tacitam fidem Seius accommodasset'; Mod. *Dig.* 5. 3. 46 'qui tacitam fidem interposuerit'. Though these instances are late, legal language is conservative; quite possibly Propertius has adapted such a phrase as *tacita fides* here.

Translate then: 'Or is it that I do not, by change of complexion, display symptoms of great import, that is, that a declaration of my loyalty is not outspoken in my countenance?'

3. 24. 13 f.

correptus saeue Veneris torrebam aeno;

uinctus eram uersas in mea terga manus.

*Aeno* is taken by Postgate as 'the torturing cauldron': a bold metaphor. Love cooks his victims for his own repast. Cf. Meleager, *A.P.* 12. 92. 9 ὀπτᾶσθ' ἐν κάλλει, τύφεσθ' ὑποκαύόμενοι νῦν, ἄκρος ἐπεὶ ψυχῆς ἐστι μάγειρος 'Ερως.' Butler and B.-B. merely quote Meleager, and translate 'cauldron'.

<sup>1</sup> The legal colour of the context should be noted—for 7-9 *cogor habere notam* etc., cf. Cic. *pro Clu.* 46. 129 'et, qui pretio adductus eripuerit patriam fortunas liberos cui innocenti, is

ensoriae seueritatis nota non inureretur?' Ovid, *Her.* 4. 32, 9. 20; for *quid tantum merui*, cf. Ter. *Andr.* 139 'quid feci? quid commerui aut peccauī, pater?'

The objection to this view is that *torrere* does not mean 'to boil', but 'to roast', as Tremenheere saw ('torments more cruel far I bore | In Venus' brazen athanor'). Nor does 'cauldron' adequately give the point of unbearable torture which the passage demands; this difficulty was felt by Passerat, who thought that some kind of branding-iron was meant.

This passage will yield to treatment similar to that employed in my note on 1. 9. 23-4 *supra*, that is, by taking it as an allusive reference to a well-known commonplace. For clear instances of such allusions cf. 1. 9. 16 'nunc tu | insanus medio flumine quaeris aquam' (Tantalus); 1. 9. 20 'cupies . . . infernae uincula nosse rotae' (Ixion); 1. 9. 31 'illis et silices et possint cedere quercus' (Orpheus); 1. 4. 9-10 'nedum si leuibus fuerit collata figuris | inferior duro iudice turpis eat' (judgement of the goddesses by Paris); 2. 7. 9 'respiciens udis prodita luminibus' and 2. 27. 16 'concessum nulla lege redibit iter' (Orpheus and Eurydice); 3. 7. 4 'semina curarum de capite orta tuo' (birth of Athena from head of Zeus); 3. 8. 37 'qui nostro nexisti retia lecto' (Ares and Aphrodite ensnared).

That Propertius can allude to a commonplace, and at the same time transfer it to an entirely different sphere is shown by 3. 18. 25 f. 'ille licet ferro cautus se condat et aere, | mors tamen inclusum protrahet inde caput', where the allusion is to Danae's brazen tower, as is obvious from comparison with 2. 20. 11 f. 'in te ego et aeratas rumpam, mea uita, catenas, | ferratam Danaes transiliamque domum'; the key to the allusion lies in the vocabulary employed.

I propose to show that here also there is a symbolic reference to a well-known topic—in this case to the story of Phalaris and the brazen bull made for him by Perillus. The proof hinges on two points: (i) the uses of the *locus* in other authors give exactly the sense of relentless torture required here; and (ii) the correspondence of vocabulary here to that in other references to the story is exact.

The minatory words of Pindar (*Pyth.* 1. 185 f.) τὸν δὲ ταύρω χαλκῶ καυτῆρα νηλέα νόον | ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παντὶ φάρις are fulfilled in Greek, and to a greater extent in Latin, literature. The use of the story, which occurs in Ovid (*Trist.* 3. 3. 41 ff.), Plutarch (*Mor.* 315 c), Polybius (12. 25. 1-3), Lucian (*Phalaris* 1. 11-12), and Orosius (*adu. Pag.* 1. 20), is attested as a *locus communis* by Seneca (*Contr. Excerpt.* 5. 8), who recommends it as material for a *controuersia*: Aristotle also, in commending the use of λόγοι in public speaking (*Ars Rhet.* 2. 20. 5), instances a tale of Phalaris' unscrupulous dealings with Stesichorus.

The following aspects of the myth occur as *exempla*: Phalaris is the type of the cruel tyrant in Cicero (*Re Pub.* 1. 28. 44, *De Off.* 2. 7. 26 'testis est Phalaris, cuius est praeter ceteros nobilitata crudelitas', *Verr.* 2. 4. 33. 73 'crudelissimus omnium tyrannorum Phalaris'), Seneca (*De Clem.* 2. 4. 3, *Dial.* 4. 5. 1), Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* 1148<sup>b</sup>24), Aelian (*Var. Hist.* 2. 4), and Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 2. 76). So Perillus in Pliny (*H.N.* 34. 89 'Perillum nemo laudat saeuiozem Phalaride tyranno'), and Valerius Maximus (9. 2 *ext.* 9 'saeuus etiam ille aenei tauri inuentor').

Phalaris is mentioned alongside other equally notorious tyrants, e.g. Pisistratus (Cic. *ad Att.* 7. 20. 2), Apollodorus (Cic. *N.D.* 3. 33, Sen. *Benef.* 7. 19. 5, Polybius 7. 7. 2, Dio Chrys. *Or.* 2. 76), Busiris (Ov. *Trist.* 3. 11. 41, Amm. Marc. 28. 1. 46, Iulianus Capella 8. 5), and Dionysius (Cic. *Verr.* 2. 5. 56. 145, Ps.-Aristotle, *Mag. Mor.* 2. 6. 33). Besides this general use is found a particular application to individuals, e.g. Verres (Cic. *Verr.* 2. 5. 56. 145), Hieronymus of Syracuse (Polyb. 7. 7. 2), Caesar (Cic. *ad Att.* 7. 12. 2, 20. 2), Caligula (Sen. *Dial.* 9. 14. 4), Maximinus (Amm. Marc. 28. 1. 46, H. A. *Maxim.* 8. 5), Domitian (Julian, *Sympos.* 311 A), and Serenianus (Amm. Marc. 26. 10. 5). (See also for less important instances Ovid, *Trist.* 3. 11. 41-4, *ex Pont.* 2. 9. 43, Sidon. *Apoll. epp.* 5. 7. 6.)

The brazen bull is the type of extreme torture (Cic. *Verr.* 2. 4. 33. 73 'ille nobilis



taurus . . . monumentum crudelitatis'); even in such torment the wise man can remain serene and happy (Cic. *Pis.* 18. 42 'sapientem, etiamsi in Phalaridis tauro inclusus torreretur, dictum tamen suaue illud esse seque ne tantulum quidem commoueri', *Tusc.* 2. 7. 18, 5. 26. 75, *de Fin.* 5. 28. 85, Sen. *Epp.* 66. 18, and Fronto, p. 184 Naber 'philosophis etiam mirificis hominibus dicentibus sapientem uirum etiamsi in Phalaridis tauro inclusum beatum nihilominus fore, facilius crediderim beatum eum fore quam posse tantisper amburenti in aeno prooemium meditari aut epigrammata scribere'). This torture, passing imagination in severity, is nonetheless preferable to the pangs of passion (Prop. 2. 25. 12), the agony of grief endured in silence (Ovid, *Trist.* 5. 1. 53), the mental torment of perjury (Juv. 8. 81), or the discomfort of political insecurity (Pers. 3. 35 ff.).

Propertius has thus transferred the stock ideas of the *locus* to Venus—he is describing her *φαλαρισμός*. At this point one might well quote A. A. Day, *Origins of Latin Love-Elegy*, p. 52: 'But Propertius, when he borrows a theme or an expression, adapts it to his own purpose . . . ; with graceful instinct he leaves the mark of his own genius upon whatever he borrows from the stock common to all poets.'

Before considering the sense of the passage in detail, I proceed to the second point, the correspondence of vocabulary here and in other occurrences of the topic.

The bull is described elsewhere as follows: *taurus aeneus* (Ovid, *Trist.* 5. 12. 47, Sen. *Contr. Excerpt.* 5. 8, Val., Max., l.c.); *ταῦρος χαλκοῦς* (Pindar, l.c., Polyb. 12. 25. 1); *uiolens taurus* (Ov. *A.A.* 1. 653); *trux taurus* (Sil. It. 14. 213); *aes* (Ov. *ex Pont.* 3. 6. 42); *aes Perilleum* (Ov. *Trist.* 5. 1. 55, *Ibis* 437); *Siculi aera iuueni* (Pers. 5. 39); *amburens aenum* (Fronto, l.c.); *τὸ χαλκοῦν* (Polyb. 12. 25. 2); *aes Paphium* (Ov. *Ibis* 440).<sup>1</sup> These examples show the existence of a stable and well-understood vocabulary for the *locus*; Propertius' *saeuo aeno* is, as it were, a blend of the above instances. It is perhaps noteworthy that Fronto's use of *aenum* in place of *aes* is jesting; Propertius may have used the word here as a wry joke.<sup>2</sup>

For the verb *torrebar* compare the following phrases used elsewhere in the Phalaris-locus: *torrere* (Ov. *ex Pont.* 2. 9. 43, *A.A.* 1. 654); *succensis ignibus torrere* (Cic. *Pis.* 18. 42); *subiectis ignibus torrere* (Orosius, l.c.); *lento igne torrere* (Ov. *Trist.* 3. 11. 43); *subiectis flammis torrere* (Sil. It. 14. 214); *κατακλείσας πῦρ ὑποκαίειν* (Lucian, l.c.); *ἀνθρωπον παροπτώμενον καὶ περιφλεγόμενον διαφθείρεσθαι* (Polyb. 12. 25. 12).

Detailing the sense of the passage in full:—Propertius describes himself as the subject of Venus, a tyrant as cruel as Phalaris (who is *durus tyrannus*, Prop. 2. 25. 12; *in sua crudelitate fastidiosus*, Sen. *Contr. Excerpt.* 5. 8; *saeuus*, Ov. *Trist.* 3. 11. 41, Pliny, *H.N.* 34. 89; *ferus*, Sen. *Benef.* 7. 19. 5, cf. *Ir.* 2. 5. 1; *ferox*, Ov. *Ibis* 439; *immanis*, Cic. *de Off.* 3. 6. 29, Sen. *Benef.* 7. 19. 5; and who, further, *modum non habet puniendi*, Sen. *de Clem.* 2. 4. 3; *in homines innocentes saeuit, uulgo saeuit et sanguine humano gaudet*, Sen. *Dial.* 4. 5. 1). Giving the thought a grotesque twist, P. imagines Venus as tormenting him in a cruel brazen mechanism—*μηχάνημα*, as Lucian calls it, or *κατασκευάσμα*, to employ Polybius' term.

The evidence for this view, being circumstantial, must needs be set forth at length;

<sup>1</sup> The epithet is strange, and deserves attention; it has no parallel, but appears to be used for *Cyprio*, the connexion between bronze and Paphos being through Cinyras, who discovered bronze deposits in Cyprus (Pliny, *H.N.* 7. 195), and established there the cult of Paphian Venus (Tac. *Hist.* 2. 3). But the phrase is strongly reminiscent of *saeuo Veneris aeno*; if Ovid had understood it as I do, he would have found his adaptation simpler to make. The twelfth-century erotic iambographer, Nicetas Eugenianus (in

whose *Drosilla and Charicles* are many echoes of Propertius), may also have understood it so; cf. 2. 120 *ἀδρὰν λαβὼν Ἐρωτος ἀνθρακουργίαν* and 3. 220-1 *αἱ αἱ, τειροῖς με τῇ καμίνῳ τοῦ πόθου, | καὶ πυρπολεῖς τὰ σπλάγχνα καὶ τὴν καρδίαν*.

<sup>2</sup> *aenum* takes its sense from the context. It = 'cauldron' in Virg. *Aen.* 7. 463, *Geo.* 1. 296, *et al.*, but 'dyeing-vat' in Ovid, *Met.* 6. 61, *et al.*, 'cooking-pot' or 'saucepan' in Petronius 74, and is used of brazen vessels generally in Pliny *H.N.* 11. 193, 12. 88.

but the correspondence of the vocabulary (which is even more striking if the passages quoted be read in full), and the aptness of every application of the topic, make it clear that a rhetorically trained reader would catch without difficulty the 'associative penumbra' of the vocabulary generally employed in the *locus*; the key being principally the verb *torrebar*.

Note in conclusion that this elegy is highly derivative, as it echoes passages from previous elegies in a significant way. Thus, ll. 3 and 4 echo 2. 25. 3; 9 echoes 2. 1. 66; 10 harks back to 1. 1. 9; 11 to 1. 1. 27; 12 to 1. 18; 15-16 to 2. 14. 29-30 (*Syrtes* in 16 to 2. 9. 33); 18 to 1. 1. 25-6. On my interpretation l. 13 here is similarly an echo of 2. 25. 11-12 'nonne fuit satius duro seruire tyranno, | et gemere in tauro, saeue Perille, tuo?'

W. R. SMYTH.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF SWANSEA.

*Addendum*:—Since writing the above, I find that my interpretation of *istis* (on 1. 2. 25 f.) was offered by Muretus. It is odd that it should have been lost; it is not mentioned even so far back as Hertzberg's edition. It is, I think, justifiable to accuse editors of laxity in neglecting so simple a solution, especially as it does not appear to have been refuted.

W. R. S.

# THE TEXT OF THE *PHAEDO* IN *W* AND IN HENRICUS ARISTIPPUS' TRANSLATION\*

## A

BURNET's and Robin's collations of *W* (cod. Vindob. 54 Suppl. Gr. 7) differ for the text of the *Phaedo* in about 130 readings of a more than orthographical interest.† A new inspection of the manuscript has shown that Robin very often corrected Burnet, but added some twenty mistakes. The actual readings of *W* and of its second hand *W*<sup>2</sup> are given in the following list; each of them is followed, after a colon, by Burnet's (*b*) and Robin's (*r*) misreadings. The Stephanus numeration refers to Burnet's edition.

57<sup>a</sup> *in tit.* ἡ περὶ ψυχῆς: om. *b* *post tit.* τὰ τοῦ διαλόγου πρόσωπα: Ἐχεκράτης etc. usque ad ὑπὲρ τῆς *W*<sup>2</sup>: primae man. trib. *r* Ἐχεκράτης Φαίδων tantum praebet, nihili n apparatu adnotans *b* 58<sup>d1</sup> ἘΧ. ἀλλὰ . . . ΦΑΙΔ. καὶ: ἘΧ. et ΦΑΙΔ. om. *b* <sup>3</sup> ἐφαίν. εἶναι: εἶναι om. *b* 59<sup>b9</sup> Παιανεύς: -νῆς *r* 60<sup>a4</sup> τοιαῦτα ἄττα: ἄττα om. *r* <sup>6</sup>7 ἀεὶ ἀναγκ.: ἀεὶ om. *b* <sup>3</sup> ἐπιτάττει: -τοὶ *b* 61<sup>d1</sup> ποιήματα: καὶ add. (*W*<sup>2</sup>) *b* <sup>5</sup> ἦν: ἦ *b* <sup>5</sup> ἰέναι *W*<sup>2</sup>: om. *b* 62<sup>c2</sup> ἀποκτινύνει: -κτεινύει *b* 63<sup>d2</sup> σοὶ: σοὶ οὕτως *b* <sup>2</sup> λέγης: -εις *b* <sup>3</sup> πειράσ. γε: γε om. *b* 64<sup>b2-3</sup> ἂν δὴ . . . ἂν: ἂν . . . ἂν δὴ *b* <sup>10</sup> ἀπερ καὶ: καὶ om. *b* 65<sup>a1</sup> ἀπολύων *W*<sup>2</sup>: primae man. trib. *b* <sup>10</sup> τις: τι *b* <sup>7</sup> γίγνηται ex γίγνεται corr. *W*<sup>2</sup>: primae man. trib. *b* γίγνεται *r* <sup>8</sup> ὅφιν: ὅφιν *r* 66<sup>b4</sup> τις *W*<sup>2</sup>: primae man. trib. *b* <sup>8</sup> οἱ πόλεμοι ἡμῖν: ἡμ. οἱ πόλ. *b* 68<sup>a1</sup> [οἰμεν] [οἰεν] *b* <sup>2-3</sup> ὄντι *ḡ*: ἦ om. *b* <sup>4</sup> ὁμοιον εἶναι: εἶναι om. *r* 69<sup>a10</sup> πάντα (ἀπ. *b*) ταῦτα: ταῦτα πάντα *r* 70<sup>a3</sup> ἀπολύηται: -ολλύ: *b* <sup>3</sup> ὁ ἄνθρ.: ὁ om. *b* <sup>8</sup> νῦν: νῦν δὴ *b* <sup>8</sup> ἐλπίς εἴη: εἴη ἐλπ. *b* <sup>7</sup> πάλιν: πάλ. γε *b* 71<sup>a12</sup> ἔστιν ἔτι: ἔτι om. *b* 72<sup>a4</sup> ἡμῖν ἄρα: ἄρα ἡμῖν *r* <sup>4</sup> τάχα: ταχὺ *b* 73<sup>a2-3</sup> τι ἔοικεν ἡ ψυχῇ: τι ἡ ψυχῇ τι ἔοικεν *b* <sup>6</sup> τοῦτον: τόνδε *b* 74<sup>b6</sup> ὅν: alteri man. trib. *r* <sup>6</sup> τοῦτων ex τοῦτο *W*<sup>2</sup>: primae man. trib. *b* <sup>13</sup> οὐδέν: οὐδέ *r* <sup>5</sup> ἐν τοῖς: ἐν om. *b* <sup>6</sup> ἔστιν ἴσον: ἴσον om. *b* <sup>3</sup> αὐτῷ: αὐτὸ *b* 75<sup>b4</sup> ὁρᾶν ἦ: ὁρ. καὶ *b* 77<sup>b2</sup> ὦ: ἔφη ὦ *b* <sup>6</sup> καὶ: τε καὶ *b* 78<sup>a1</sup> τὸν τοιοῦτον: τῶν τοιούτων *b* <sup>8</sup> ταῦτὰ ταῦτα: ταῦτα om. *r* <sup>8</sup> τὰ ξύθητα: τὰ om. *b* <sup>10</sup> ταῦτα: ταῦτὰ *b* <sup>5</sup> αὐ ἔφη ταῦτα: αὐ et ταῦτα om. *b* 79<sup>b10</sup> ἐλέγ. φύς: φύς. ἐλέγ. *r* 80<sup>a2</sup> ταῦτα: ταῦτὰ *b* <sup>3</sup> ὁμοιότατον ex ὁμοιον corr. *W*<sup>2</sup>: primae man. trib. *b* <sup>4</sup> εὐδαιμονίῃ: διαλ. *b* <sup>5-6</sup> τοῦτο τοῦτο: τοῦτο τὸ *r* 81<sup>a9</sup> θεῶν: τῶν θεῶν *b* <sup>4</sup> ἀλλὰ: ἀλλὰ καὶ *b* 82<sup>a11</sup> τε καὶ: τε om. *b* <sup>2</sup> αὐτῶν: ἐαυτ. *b* <sup>7</sup> ἐκείνη ex ἐκεῖνο corr. *W*<sup>2</sup>: primae man. trib. *b* 83<sup>a7</sup> εἰς αὐτήν: εἰς αὐτ. *b* <sup>5</sup> ὁν: ὁ om. *b* <sup>6</sup> τῷ: τῷ *r* <sup>8</sup> τε καὶ: τε om. *b* <sup>6</sup> τέ εἰσι: εἰσι τε *b* 84<sup>d5</sup> ἡμῶν: -ῖν *r* 85<sup>a1</sup> πλείστα ἔδουσι (καὶ μάλιστα supra add. *W*<sup>2</sup>): πλείστα καὶ κάλλιστα ἔδ. (μάλιστα s.v.) *b* <sup>3</sup> αὐτῶν: αὐτ. *b* <sup>5</sup> γε: τε *b* <sup>1-2</sup> ἔμοι γὰρ: ἔμοιγε *b* <sup>3</sup> ἦδῃ: ἦ δὴ *b* 86<sup>a4</sup> ἡ διαρρ.: καὶ διαρρ. *b* <sup>5</sup> διαβλεψάμενος: -ψας *b* 87<sup>c3</sup> δὴ τυνος: δὴ om. *b* 89<sup>c11</sup> τί: τι *b* <sup>3</sup> γρ. καὶ σὺ: γρ. σὺ *b* 90<sup>a6</sup> ἄλλ': ἄλλο *b* <sup>4</sup> ὁμοιοι: ὁμοιοι οἱ *r* <sup>6</sup> ἀληθεῖ: -θῆ (-θεῖ *W*<sup>2</sup>) *r* <sup>7</sup> ἔφην: om. *b* <sup>8</sup> φαίδων: φ. ἔφη *b* <sup>6</sup> δέοντων: δέ ὄντων *b* <sup>1</sup> οὐδέν οὐδέν: semel om. *b* 91<sup>a8</sup> προθυμῆσομαι: προθυμηθήσομαι *b* <sup>2</sup> μέντοι: μέν τι *b* <sup>7</sup> ἐγώμην *W*<sup>2</sup>: ὡς ἐγώμην (*W*<sup>2</sup>) *r* 92<sup>c5</sup> τῷ: τῷ *b* <sup>7</sup> ἐρρήθη: ἐρρήθη *b* 93<sup>a9</sup> αὐτῆς: αὐτ. *b* <sup>14</sup> ἀρμωσθῆναι: -σθῆ καὶ *b* <sup>8</sup> νοῦν: νοῦν τε *r* <sup>3</sup> τιθεμένων . . . τίς τί: θεμένων . . . τί τις *b* 94<sup>a6-7</sup> οὐδέ γε usque ad προειρημένων *W*<sup>2</sup>: primae man. trib. *b* 95<sup>b1</sup> οὐν: μὲν οὐν *b* <sup>5</sup> ἡμῶν: -ῖν *b* <sup>7</sup> μνησύν: -ει *r* <sup>3</sup> διαφύγει: -γη *b* 96<sup>b2</sup> τὸ ψυχρὸν: τὸ om. *b* <sup>8</sup> γὰρ ἔγωγε: ἔγωγε om. *b* 97<sup>a4</sup> αὐτοῖς αἰτία: αἰτ. αὐτ. *b* <sup>1</sup> ἦ: ἦ *b* <sup>2</sup> συνήγχετο πλησίον: συν. τὸ πλ. *b* <sup>8</sup> πότερόν ἐστιν: ἐστιν om. *b* <sup>4</sup> αὐτῇ: -ῖν *b* 98<sup>b8</sup> ὁρῶ: ὁρῶν *r* <sup>3</sup> αὐτῶν ἐμβολαῖς: αὐτ. συμβολ. *b* 99<sup>d1</sup> ἦ: ἦ *b* <sup>100</sup> λόγοις: τοῖς λόγ. *b* <sup>2-3</sup> ἔργους: ἐν ἔργ. *r* <sup>7</sup> ἀληθῆ: οὐκ ἄλ. *b* <sup>4</sup> ὅπερ: ὅ *b* <sup>7-8</sup> καλὰ: καλὰ καλὰ *b*

\* H. Klos is responsible for the collation of the passages of *W* quoted in part A; L. Minio-Paluello for the rest of this note.

† J. Burnet, *Platonis Opera*, i<sup>2</sup>, Oxf. 1905, and *Plato's Phaedo*, Oxf. 1911; L. Robin, *Phédon*, Paris, 1926 (*Oeuvres compl. de Plat.* iv. 1, 'Belles Lettres').—On *W* see: J. Král, 'Über d. Platocod. d. wiener Hofbibl. suppl. phil. gr. 7' (*Wien. St. xiv* [1892], 161–208), and O. Immisch, *Philol.*

*Stud. zu Pl., II: De recens. Plat. praesid. atq. ration.*, Leipz. 1903.

‡ This is the reading given by Robin in the text, most probably a misprint.

§ L.-&-S s.v. ἐρῶ exemplifies ἐρρήθη only from *Aristot. Categ.* 11<sup>b12</sup>, 14; the oldest MS of the *Categ.* (Ambros. L 93, 9th cent.) reads ἐρρήθη in both passages. ἐρρήθη is probably a Byzantine, or simply a wrong, spelling.

101<sup>c5</sup> ἀλλὰ  
104<sup>a5</sup> αὐτῆς  
ut videtur  
αὐτῶν: αὐτ  
110<sup>a4</sup> φύε  
man. trib.  
καὶ: ὅδ. τε  
ὄντα om. *r*  
ex Σωκράτ  
κερδαίνει:

Immi  
Aristipp  
the trans  
identify  
as *W*<sup>2</sup>; †  
After co  
by Bekk  
that Ari  
to that  
identifie  
dental;  
same typ  
of distan  
by, or fo

The  
translati  
word: ti  
μήν, τε  
tis—are  
same Gr  
reconstr  
preposit  
the Gree  
optative  
perfect,  
to repro  
produce  
Greek,  
between

\* O. I.  
Aristippu  
L. Metel  
Arist.' (*Corp. P.*  
Kordeute  
(*Corp. P.*  
and L. I.  
de Moerl  
206–35).  
being pr  
passage  
lished by  
(*Hermes*,



101<sup>c5</sup> ἀλλὰ: ἀλλ' ἢ b 102<sup>d1</sup> ὑπερέχων: ὑπέχων b d<sub>5</sub> δὲ: δὴ r 103<sup>d5</sup> χιόνα: χιόνα γ' b  
 104<sup>a5</sup> αὐτῆς: αὐτ. b 105<sup>b1</sup> οὐδὲ δὴ: δὴ om. b c<sub>1</sub> φ: δ ut videtur b c<sub>4</sub> φ...φ...δ: δ ter  
 ut videtur b c<sub>9</sub> δ: φ r 106<sup>d2</sup> σχολή: -ῆ b 107<sup>a3</sup> δὴ τις: δὴ τι b b<sub>5</sub> γε εὖ: τε εὖ b c<sub>7</sub>  
 αὐτῶν: αὐτ. b 108<sup>d2</sup> τῆς γῆς: τῆς om. b d<sub>3</sub> ἂν οὐν: οὐν ἂν b 109<sup>a2</sup> αὐτὴν τε: τε om. b  
 110<sup>a4</sup> φύεται: φύετ. οὐδὲν b b<sub>6</sub> αὐτῇ: αὐτῇ b b<sub>7</sub> διελημμένη ex διελημμένη corr. W<sup>2</sup>: primae  
 man. trib. b d<sub>6</sub> τε λειότ.: τε λειότ. b c<sub>5</sub> τοῖς λίθ. καὶ τῇ γῇ: τοῖς et τῇ om. b 111<sup>a7-8</sup> ὅδωρ  
 καὶ: ὅδ. τε καὶ b b<sub>2</sub> αὐτῆς ex corr.: αὐτῆς b 112<sup>d3</sup> ἢ εἰ: εἰ om. b 113<sup>c4-5</sup> τοιαῦτα ὄντα:  
 ὄντα om. r 114<sup>d8</sup> αὐτοῦ: -ῆς r c<sub>5</sub> εἰαυτῆς: αὐτ. b 115<sup>d8</sup> παραμένειν: -εἶν b c<sub>4</sub> Σωκράτης  
 ex Σωκράτῃ corr. W<sup>2</sup>: Σωκράτῃ b 116<sup>b5</sup> αὐτὸς: αὐτ. b c<sub>6</sub> ἀφικόμενων: ἀφικόμενων b c<sub>8</sub>  
 κερδαίνειν: -αεῖν r 118<sup>a14</sup> τε καὶ: τε om. b subscriptio Φαίδων ἢ περὶ ψυχῆς: om. b et r.

## B

Immisch examined one page (66<sup>b5-67b1</sup>) and a few other readings of Henricus Aristippus' translation of the *Phaedo* (A.D. 1156), and concluded that the text used by the translator was of the same kind as that given by W.\* Burnet 'found it possible to identify the manuscript which he [Aristippus] used: it is the one . . . commonly known as W';† no evidence seems to have been produced by Burnet to support this claim. After comparing the whole translation with the Greek texts and apparatuses given by Bekker,‡ Burnet, and Robin, and with the readings of W listed above, we think that Aristippus' Greek copy (which we shall call P) offered a text extremely similar to that of W and of other manuscripts belonging to the same class; but it cannot be identified with W, because of a number of different readings which cannot be accidental; in fact, it agrees on several points, against W, with other manuscripts of the same type, especially with Δ (Vatic. Gr. 225), and on other points with manuscripts of distant classes; some readings of P are not found in any of the manuscripts collated by, or for, Bekker, Burnet, and Robin.

The text of P can be reconstructed in all but minor details from Aristippus' translation. Every Greek word is rendered by one—rarely more than one—Latin word: the only exceptions are the article and some particles—*αὖν*, *γε*, *δέ*, *δὴ*, *μέν*, *μὴν*, *τε*—which are sometimes omitted; in a few instances some pronouns—*ἐγώ*, *τίς*—are also omitted. A Latin word is often made to correspond to one and the same Greek word all through the *Phaedo*; ambiguities which may affect our possible reconstruction of the Greek text are limited to the particles just mentioned, some prepositions, and a few more words. Latin moods and tenses are made to render the Greek verbal forms as closely as possible; but the future sometimes translates the optative or the subjunctive, and the perfect of the indicative may correspond to the perfect, aorist, and also imperfect. § The final text of Aristippus' version can be taken to reproduce his Greek text with all the exactitude of which he was capable. He first produced a preliminary translation, then went through it, comparing it with the Greek, and adding a large number of corrections and synonymous Latin words between the lines of a copy of his Latin text, and finally published a perfected

\* O. Immisch, op. cit. 33-9. On Henricus Aristippus and his translation of the *Phaedo* see: L. Metelli, 'Sulle due redaz. del Fed. lat. di Arist.' (*Atti R. Ist. Ven.* xcvi. ii. 113-40); V. Kordeuter and C. Labowsky, *Memo*, Lond. 1940 (*Corp. Platon. Med. Aevi*, *Plato Lat.* i), ix-xi; and L. Minio-Paluello, 'Henri Aristippe, Guill. de Moerb. . . ' (*Rev. philos. de Louv.* xlv [1947], 206-35). An edition of Aristippus' *Phaedo* is now being printed as vol. ii of the *Plato Lat.*; the passage examined by Immisch had been published by V. Rose, 'Die Lücke im Diog. Laert. . . ' (*Hermes*, i [1866]), 372-3; some readings were

published by N. Forster, *Platonis Dialogi V*, Oxf. 1745, 1752, 1765, 1800 (from the Oxford MS. of Aristippus' translation), and by D. Wyttenbach, *Plat. Phaed.*, Leyden 1810, and Leipzig 1825 (from the Leyden MS.).

† J. Burnet, *How Platonism Came to England*, Cambr. 1924 (reprinted in *Essays and Addresses*, Lond. 1929, 265-76), 8 (= 273).

‡ I. Bekker, *Platonis Scripta Omnia v*, Lond. 1826.

§ On Aristippus' method of translating see the article in *Rev. philos. de Louv.* quoted above, 211-20.

version based on his preliminary rendering, his interlinear notes, and again the Greek original.\* The Greek text underlying the different renderings at the various stages of the translation appears to have always been one and the same. Miss Metelli's evidence to the contrary (op. cit. 135) is inconclusive, and seems rather to support our view. She was able to find, in the whole of the *Phaedo*, not more than three points where the preliminary and the final versions are based, in her opinion, on two clearly different Greek texts. In each of these instances she had to suppose, for one of the versions, a Greek reading not testified by any known manuscript; and, in each case, at least equally valid hypotheses can be suggested to explain the changes between the two stages of the translation.† The unity of the Greek text underlying the three stages of the translation, and the close similarity of the text of *Φ* with that of the preserved manuscripts of one definite family, make it very unlikely that Aristippus had more than one Greek manuscript at his disposal; if he had more than one, they must have been very similar to each other, or he must have drawn from one or some of them only very few readings, and the same readings when he was first translating the *Phaedo*, and later revising his version. We assume that he had one manuscript.

The family of manuscripts to which *Φ* belonged includes the codd. Vindob. Suppl. Gr. 7 (*W*) and Vatic. Gr. 225 (Bekker's *Δ*)—both as old as, or older than, *Φ*—and the more recent codd. Paris. Bibl. Nat. 1813, ol. 2818 (Bekk. *G*), Vindob. Phil. Gr. V, ol. 32 (Bekk. *Φ*), Ambros. D 71 sup. (Bekk. *s*), and the second hand of the Clarkianus (*B*<sup>2</sup>). The codd. Vatic. Palat. 173 of the eleventh century (Bekk. *Δ*), Lobkowiciensis, and Vatic. Gr. 1029 (Bekk. *r*), which have not yet been collated as regards the *Phaedo*, are also stated to belong to this family.‡ It can easily be proved that *Φ* really belongs to this group of manuscripts. In the first sixth of the *Phaedo* the readings characteristic of this family§ which can be safely compared with the Latin are those listed below, together with Aristippus' renderings. In each case *Φ* agrees with these readings:

57 <sup>a2</sup> ἐπιεν τὸ φάρμακον: bibit farmacum	58 <sup>a8</sup> πέμπουσιν κατ' ἑτος: mittunt quotannis	<sup>a11</sup>
ποτε Θεσεύς: quondam Theseus	66-7 τίνα ἦν: que erant	<sup>a8</sup> ἐταίρους: amicos
παρίστασθαι ἐκεῖνον: unde . . . constabat illum	59 <sup>b7</sup> αὐτοῦ Κρίτων: eius Criton	<sup>a5</sup> ὥστε . . .
εἶναι: videtur esse	6 τῷ σκέλει πρότερον: crure prius	<sup>a6</sup> χρή με: oporteat me
ἐνόμιζον μὴ ἀπέναι πρότερον πρὶν αὖ: rebar non abire prius ante quam	<sup>a1</sup> τὰ σκέλη ἀπὸ τῆς κλίνης:	
suras a lecto	62 <sup>c8</sup> παρούσαν ἡμῖν: presentem michi (vel sibi)	63 <sup>c8</sup> πότερον αὐτὸς οὕτως: utrum
ipse sic	<sup>d2</sup> ἔσται: erit	64 <sup>d11</sup> σοι δοκεῖ: tibi videtur
horum ipsam	66 <sup>b4</sup> ἡμᾶς ἐκφέρειν: nos efferre	<sup>e8</sup> ἡμῖν: nobis.

\* The results of Aristippus' work in the three stages are still preserved; see Metelli, op. cit. Her opinion that the revisions are not Aristippus' work is not supported by facts or reasonable argument; cf. *Rev. philos. de Louv.* 212, n. 14.

† At 69<sup>a7</sup> ἀλλαγὴ ἡδονᾶς was rightly translated by *commercium voluptates* in the first version; but Aristippus had not understood the sentence, and translated the ὁρθὴ connected with ἀλλαγὴ by *recta*; in his revision he thought the sense was more acceptable by reading ἀλλά γ' ἡδονὰς or ἀλλά γ' ἡ ἡδονὰς, and translating *immo voluptates*. At 82<sup>b6</sup> ἡ πον μελιττῶν is rightly rendered by *vel apum* in the final version; in one MS. of the first version we read *vel canum*, in the other the meaningless *vel cāu*; there must have been an unreadable mistake for *apum* in the common source of those two MSS., and there is

no reason to conjecture—as Miss Metelli does—for *vel canum* an ἡ ποιμενικῶν, which Aristippus would never have translated in that way. At 97<sup>b5</sup> Aristippus' *neque aliud vel alium quempiam* in the final version, in the place of *neque aliud nichil* of the first, for οὐδ' ἄλλο οὐδέν, is probably the result of a possible alternative—in the masculine—added by Aristippus between the lines of his final copy, in a passage which he had not understood, and which does not make sense in either of his versions.

‡ See Immisch, op. cit. 65, 70.

§ For the present purpose we consider as strictly characteristic of this family those readings which appear in *W* and *Δ*, and possibly in other manuscripts of the same group, but not in *B*, *T*, *Y*, and the manuscripts connected with them.

When 9  
and also

60<sup>c5</sup>  
d6 δ μέλ  
absolven

There a  
manusc  
coincide  
known

The  
extends

(a)  
within  
traditio  
ἡδονῶν  
malorum

(b)  
than W  
and it i  
manusc  
ἀνόνητο  
113<sup>b8</sup>-c

(c)  
Greek t  
be conf  
73<sup>a2</sup> Ari  
accomp  
(= ? πα  
θοῦντος)  
stages  
he must  
or into

This  
but can  
relation  
reading  
class, a  
προειρη  
Φ and Δ  
For exa

NATI  
OF

Add  
and ὁρά

When  $\Phi$  does not agree with both  $W$  and  $\Delta$ , it agrees almost always with one of them, and also with other manuscripts of the same family:

60<sup>c5</sup> αὐτῷ  $\Delta\Phi sG$ : ipsi    61<sup>c8</sup> ἔφη  $\Delta\Phi sGB^2$ : ait    63<sup>a4-5</sup> δοκεῖ τί μοι  $\Delta sG$ : videtur quid michi  
 d6 δ μέλλων δώσειν  $W\Phi s$ : qui debet dare    64<sup>c8</sup> ἦ  $\Delta G$ : est (vel sit)    65<sup>a1</sup> ἀπολύων  $W^2\Delta\Phi sG$ :  
 absolvens    10<sup>c5</sup> τι  $\Delta\Phi sG$ : quid    e7 μήποτε  $W\Phi s$ : numquam    66<sup>b4</sup> τις  $W^2\Delta\Phi s$ : quedam.

There are only two instances, in this part of the *Phaedo*, in which  $\Phi$  agrees with other manuscripts, against both  $W$  and  $\Delta$ : 59<sup>a2</sup> εἶναι om.  $L$ ; and 61<sup>c4</sup> ἐγὼ om.  $s$ ; the latter coincidence may well be accidental. In one point  $\Phi$  agrees with  $W^2$  against all the known tradition: 61<sup>c5</sup> ἔναι: ire.

The agreement between  $\Phi$  and the family to which  $W$ ,  $\Delta$ ,  $\Phi$ ,  $s$ ,  $G$ , and  $B^2$  belong extends to the whole dialogue. It may be enough to mention that:

(a) In four cases only, all of them within two Stephanus pages—three of them within less than twenty lines—does  $\Phi$  agree with all, or nearly all, the rest of our tradition against  $W$ ,  $W^2$ ,  $\Delta$ , and the other manuscripts of this family (81<sup>b4</sup> ἐπιθυμιῶν καὶ ἡδονῶν: concupiscentiis et voluptatibus; 83<sup>a5</sup> ὠτων: aures; b8 ἦ: aut; c2 κακῶν: malorum).

(b) Instances of agreement between  $\Phi$  and one or more manuscripts other than  $W$  and  $\Delta$  are relatively very few—perhaps not more than twenty or thirty—and it is impossible to establish any relationship between  $\Phi$  and any of these other manuscripts or groups of manuscripts (e.g. 84<sup>d3</sup> ἀπορήσειν  $\Delta I$ : ambigere; 95<sup>c4</sup> ἀνόνητον  $\Phi s$ : inutili; 98<sup>b7</sup> ἐλπίδος ὧ ἐταῖρε  $BYEY$ : spe o dilecte; 110<sup>b5</sup> λέγε  $\Delta$ : dic; 113<sup>b8-c1</sup> Ὠκεανός  $HE$ : Oceanus).

(c) There are some points in Aristippus' translation which seem to presuppose a Greek text different from those of known manuscripts; but the points in which it can be confidently said that he *must* have had a different Greek text are very few (e.g. 73<sup>a2</sup> Aristippus does not translate εἶδει, and renders in the neuter the adjectives which accompany that word; he would translate εἶδος by 'species'; 79<sup>b6</sup> παντί: omnino (= ? πάντῃ); 81<sup>e1</sup> τοῦ ζυνεπακολουθοῦντος: vivendi consequenti (= τοῦ ζῆν ἐπακολουθοῦντος); 91<sup>b5-6</sup> οὐ ξυνδιατελεῖ: Aristippus gives three translations at the different stages of his translation: 'quod permanet, acutum perficiat, celeriter complebitur'; he must have read οξυνδιατελεῖ, which he did not know whether to divide into δ ξυνδ. or into δξύν δ.; 101<sup>d6</sup> διδοίης: metuas (= ? δεδίης).

This evidence clearly shows, we think, that  $\Phi$  belongs to the family of  $W$ ,  $\Delta$ , etc., but cannot be identified with either  $W$  or  $\Delta$ . It also seems impossible to establish the relationship, within that family, between  $\Phi$ ,  $W$ , and  $\Delta$ , because each of them has readings in which it agrees with the rest of the tradition, or at least the rest of that class, against the other two. E.g.,  $\Delta$  against  $\Phi$  and  $W$ : the two lines 94<sup>a6-7</sup> οὐδέ . . . προειρημένων are missing in  $\Phi$  and  $W$ , and in no other known manuscript;  $W$  against  $\Phi$  and  $\Delta$ : 74<sup>c3</sup> αὐτὸ (αὐτῷ  $W$ ): ipsum; 93<sup>a14</sup> ἀρμοσθῇ καὶ (ἀρμοσθῆναι  $W$ ): moduletur et. For examples of  $\Phi$  against  $W$  and  $\Delta$  see above.

H. KLOS.

L. MINIO-PALUELLO.

NATIONALBIBLIOTHEK, VIENNA.

ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

*Addendum:* In Robin's 4th edition (1949) the misprints ὄφιν, (65<sup>c8</sup>), μηνύει (95<sup>c7</sup>), and ὄρων (98<sup>b8</sup>) noted above p. 126, n. ‡, are corrected.



## NOTES ON ORIENTIUS' *COMMONITORIUM*. I.

ORIENTIUS, Bishop of Auch (*Augusta Ausciorum*) in the early fifth century, possessed a talent for elegiac verse of no despicable order, and this he exercised in a didactic poem of 518 distichs, (known without indeed any good authority) as the *Commonitorium*. This poem, consisting of two books, describes and exhorts the reader to follow the Christian mode of life, and is characterized by its unassuming simplicity, some effective description, a number of well-turned lines (one of which has attained a modest renown, viz. 2. 184 'uno fumauit Gallia tota rogo'), and a sincere belief in the truths he was preaching. The language is in general clear and direct, though tinged here and there with turns of a decidedly late flavour.

The tradition depends on A, *codex Ashburnhamensis* or *Turonensis*,<sup>1</sup> of the tenth century, occasionally corrected by a different hand, and on B, Martin Delrio's transcription (1600) of a *codex Aquicinctensis*, now long lost, which contained the first book only; of these two authorities the readings of A are for the most part superior to those of B. No other manuscript is known to exist; the readings ascribed by Schurtzfleisch (1716) to an Oxford codex have been shown merely to represent certain marginal corrections (= Bodl. corr.) in the Bodleian copy of Rivinus's edition (published 1651), or the actual text of Rivinus.

The *editio princeps* (Book I only) was published by Delrio, an exceptionally able latinist, at Antwerp in 1600; the text was a careful reproduction of the *cod. Aquicinct.*, emendations of Delrio himself as well as of J. Lipse, Schondonch, and Fabricius being included in the margins. The first complete edition of the poem, based on A, was the work of E. Martène, and was published at Rouen in 1700, when A was first discovered; his text is available in Migne's *Patrol.*, vol. lxi (1847).<sup>2</sup> Among subsequent contributions special mention should be made of the brilliant emendations of Jean Commire (1701). Of the two modern editions that by Robinson Ellis (*Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat.*, vol. xvi, *Poet. Christ. Min.*, 1888) is easily the superior. A number of passages are, however, left in an unsatisfactory state and little help is given on points of interpretation. The other work is that by L. Bellanger, *Le Poème d'Orientius* (Paris and Toulouse, 1903), which includes not only a critical edition but also a translation, notes on numerous passages, and a series of chapters on various Orientian matters. Bell.'s text is marred by the introduction of many rash conjectures, mainly the work of L. Havet,<sup>3</sup> his erst-while teacher, and of himself, and in general the editor's critical sense and knowledge of Latin do not prove equal to his task.<sup>4</sup> Various notes on particular passages have appeared since E.'s edition (e.g. a useful contribution by L. C. Purser in *Hermath.*, xiii (1905), pp. 36-69), but a number of passages still remain in need of elucidation or

<sup>1</sup> The manuscript was removed from Tours by the light-fingered Libri in 1842 and subsequently sold by him to Lord Ashburnham. It is now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, No. 457.

<sup>2</sup> The Migne work is a reprint of Galland's edition in *Bibliotheca graeco-lat. uel. patr.* 10 (1765-81), the text being that of Martène.

<sup>3</sup> *Rev. de phil.*, xxvi (1902), pp. 149-57. A pretty specimen of H.'s handiwork is to be found in 2. 157 f., where the perfectly intelligible words 'haec [blessings which the reader can imagine he may find in Heaven] quia conscendunt animos et mente uidentur, inferiora illis crede futura bonis'

[blessings actually realized in Heaven] are metamorphosed by H., 'très heureusement' claims Bell., into *haec quia confundunt animos, commenta uidentur*, etc. Cf. 144 '(praemia) ipso non sensu praeneditata prius' and the source, viz. 1 Cor. 2. 9 'quod . . . nec in cor hominis ascendit, quae praepraeparauit deus iis qui diligunt illum'. But to H. manuscript authority and scriptural influence meant nothing.

<sup>4</sup> It is, however, only just to add that on questions other than those of reading and interpretation Bell.'s work contains much that is valuable and informative.

amendment.<sup>1</sup> The most recent contribution, a commentary and translation together with an introduction, by Sister M. D. Tobin,<sup>2</sup> adds little to the understanding of *Orient.* and is full of inaccuracies (see R. M. Henry, *Cl. Rev.*, vol. lxi, 1947, p. 30). The passages dealt with in the following notes are amongst those whose text or interpretation appears to me open to doubt or misunderstanding. In each case the text quoted is that of Ellis.

1. 3 f. quae caelum reseret, mortem fuget, aspera uitet,  
felici currat tramite, disce uiam.

3. *uitet* A Ellis Bell., *uincat* B. The statement that the Christian way of life 'shuns the rough' comes strangely indeed from an apologist of the faith: such a life does not shun the rough, but surmounts it, just as it 'routs death' (cf. 2. 87 'ardua praecipimur'). The palpable impropriety, though already pointed out by Sittl,<sup>3</sup> is still retained by Bell., who (p. 38) refers to S. but makes the strange plea 'mais si l'on prend *uitet* dans le sens de "ne pas s'exposer aux dangers", ne peut-on pas le garder?' and comes to the no less strange conclusion that 'la question est tranchée par le *felici tramite* du v. 4'.<sup>4</sup> We must certainly read *uincat*, regarding it as one of the occasional instances<sup>5</sup> in which B's reading is superior to that of A. The corruption may have arisen from the spelling *uicat*, read as *uitat*, and subsequently corrected into the subjunctive; possibly *uitae* at the end of v. 1 may have had its influence.

1. 85-7 sensu maiori uincentem uerba loquentis,  
unum, incorporeum, perpetuoque sacrum,  
omnia complexum uel semper in omnibus unum.

85. *sensu* AB, *censu* Delr.; *maiore* BA<sup>1</sup>, *maiori* corr. A. Though the right reading, viz. *sensu maiorem*, was indicated by Baehr. (concealed in E.'s ed. in a suppl. append., p. 254, and not even noticed by Bell.), both editors allow themselves to be taken in by A's correction. The obscure expression *sensu maiori*, which Bell. seeks to illuminate by the note (p. 42) 'le mot *sensu* s'opposant au mot *uerba*: "l'idée est tellement grande que les paroles ne la sauraient rendre" . . .', remains as obscure as ever. *maiore* simply represents *maiorē* from which the stroke had disappeared, *maiori* being an easy

<sup>1</sup> A passage which has been subjected to some heartless butchery (Nettleship, Havet, Bell., Hitchcock, Purser 'what printers call "pie" . . . men do not live for a thousand years') is 2. 215 ff., but the right reading now seems reasonably clear. As has been indicated (see Galdi, *Athenaeum*, vi, 1928, pp. 32 ff.), the lines are inspired by Hieron. *Epist.* 60. 14. 3 'inter eum, qui decem uixit annos, et illum, qui mille, postquam idem uitae finis aduenerit et inrecusabilis mortis necessitas, transactum omne tantundem est'; we should, accordingly, read 'inter eum (Schurtz-fleisch, *mereunt* A) decies qui ternos uixerit annos | atque illum uixit qui modo millesimum (Schurtzfl., *missile sim* A<sup>1</sup>, *missile sim* A<sup>2</sup>), | postquam postremus finis retinebit utrumque, | certe supremo tempore mortis idem est', i.e. 'between him . . . and him who has now (*modo* = *nunc*; cf. 1. 423, 2. 384) lived his thousandth year . . . there is no difference'. I see no reason why Moricca (*Didaskaleion*, v, 1927) should substitute *uiuat* for *uixit* (on the grounds that *modo* requires a present tense). Still less is there to be said for

Galdi's extraordinary *millesimus*, which he thinks O., poor barbarous fellow, might use as = 'millenarian', and assumption that *modo* = *quidem, tamen*. For *millesimum* cf. *suspitione* in 1. 438, *herēmo* 2. 170.

<sup>2</sup> *Orientii Commonitorium*, A Commentary with an Introduction and Translation, *Catholic University of America Patr. Stud.*, vol. lxxiv, Washington, 1945.

<sup>3</sup> Bursian's *Jahresb. ü. d. Fort. d. klass. Alt.* lix (1889), p. 25.

<sup>4</sup> He translates 'quels moyens . . . nous permettent d'éviter les difficultés et de suivre le chemin de traverse qui mène au bonheur'. This is perverseness indeed; *trames* here as often means no more than 'path'; with the above cf. Prud. *Peri.* 5. 369 f. 'cui recta celso *tramite* | reseratur ad patrem *uia*', and also Dracont. *Laud. dei* 3. 746 'sit mihi longa dies *felici tramite uitae*' (Sil. 6. 120 *cliuoso tramite uitae*).

<sup>5</sup> For other instances see Ellis, p. 199, and Purser, l.c., p. 38, n. 2. Cf. the notes on 1. 115 and 1. 505.

though meaningless correction, and we must certainly read *sensu maiorem*, placing a comma after *maiolem* and with Baehr. interpreting 'qui maior est quam ut sentiri possit'. Such language is common enough, e.g. Lact. *Epit.* 3. 1 'quem nec aestimare sensu ualeat humana mens nec eloqui lingua mortalis. sublimior enim ac maior est quam ut possit aut cogitatione hominis aut sermone comprehendere'. For the comparative expression cf. Quint. *Inst.* 1. 2. 28 'maiora intellectu . . . animos (*puerorum*) non subibunt', etc.<sup>1</sup>

86. A further epithet *perpetuum* seems far more natural than the adverb *perpetuo*, and we should, I think, read *perpetuumque* (so Martène), Schondonch's correction of *perpetuoque* (AB Ellis Bell.), removing the commas before and after *incorporeum*. For the exceptional use of *-que* in this position cf. Dracont. *Laud. dei* 2. 106 'tertius unus idem, primus mediusque perennis'.

1. 103 f. qui tibi, quod membris constas, quod mente moueris,  
quod lingua loqueris, quod ratione sapis (*ministrat*).

103. *mente moueris* (AB edd.) offers no convincing sense. O. is listing the various parts of the human ensemble and specifies the primary function of each. No one is going to believe that the poet is here referring to movement as being directed by the brain ('l'intelligence te meut' Bell.). Movement is indeed mentioned in 105 and it is the foot which imparts it (*graderis pede*). A verb is required which indicates an action characteristic of the mind, and we must correct to *moneris*, i.e. 'the mind instructs, prompts you'. *mens* and *moneo* are, of course, etymologically connected, and O., though hardly aware of this, may have been conscious of some affinity between the words. The confusion of *moneo* and *moueo* in manuscripts is not infrequent.

1. 115 f. noctes atque dies succedunt mensibus anni,  
sol splendet, lucent sidera, luna rubet.

115. *noctes* A Ellis Bell., *noctibus* B Delr. ('quo perit asyndeton' E.). The line as printed in E.'s text certainly will not do, and Bell.'s punctuation, viz. comma after *succedunt*, does little to improve it. Nor can we accept Baehr.'s *sibi cedunt*. B's reading, *noctibus* (parallel with *mensibus*), must surely be right, but *atque* is inappropriate and represents, I suggest, a corruption of *usque* ('unceasingly'). Read, therefore,

noctibus usque dies succedunt, mensibus anni.

B's reading thus represents the first stage in the corruption, *noctib; atque dies*, from which the commonplace phrase *noctes atque dies*<sup>2</sup> read in A would easily develop; cf. 1. 139 where for *nubila* B has *nubile*, the first stage, A *nobile*, the second, and 1. 85 where for *maiorē*, i.e. *maiolem*, B has *maiore* and A corrects its original reading *maiore* into *maiori* (see above note).

1. 137 f. nec modo terreno tantum seruire iubetur  
per varios usus subdita terra homini.

The poet goes on to say that man has at his disposal also the fowl of the air and the fish of the sea. *terreno* seems to have been generally misunderstood, being taken as the ablative of the substantive *terrenum* ('ground'): thus it is explained by Ellis in his ind. *s. terrenum* as = *in superficie terrarum*; Bell. translates 'et ce n'est pas seulement par son sol que la terre . . .'; Purser (l.c., p. 47, n. 2) refers to *terrenum* as a substantive. O. is thus made to speak as if the air and the sea formed part of the earth; certainly, no intelligible sense is yielded. There can, I think, be no doubt that *terreno* is an ad-

<sup>1</sup> Since this was written, I find that Baehr. (Fleckeisens *Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Pädag.*, cxxxvii, 1888, 'Ad Orientium', pp. 389 ff.) makes an apt reference to Min. Fel. 18. 8 hic (*deus*) non uideri

potest: uisu clarior est; nec comprehendere: tactu purior est; nec aestimari: sensibus maior est.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 6. 127 'noctes atque dies patet atri ianua Ditis', etc.



jective in agreement with *homini* (cf. 1. 503 'e terra genitum terrena in munera ferrum'). My original view was that we should ascribe to O. an exceptional artificiality of order and render 'and earthly man it is not merely earth only that is bidden to serve'. The order involved may well, however, be difficult to accept, and Mr. D. L. Page has suggested to me a considerable improvement on my interpretation which gives both a more natural order and also an admirable sense. He takes *modo* with *terreno*, *tantum* with *terra*, and renders 'it is not *only* earth that is commanded to serve a *merely terrene* man', explaining 'i.e. because man is served by air and sea also, he ceases to be "merely terrene"'.<sup>1</sup>

1. 247 f. et licet haec melius mutarit gratia Christi,  
mitia quae potius quam uiolenta docet.

247. As above AB. Havet, followed by Bell., unable to believe that a Latin writer could deviate from the respectable *in melius mutare* (cf. Tac. *Hist.* 1. 50), alters to *haec licet in melius*. The reading of the manuscripts does, it is true, involve a striking use of the adverb; an exact parallel occurs, however, in Paul. Petric. 1. 194 'auctores generis festino uisere uoto | optat et auersas melius conuertere mentes'.

1. 377-80 sanctus <is> et uictor per tot modo proelia miles,  
heu male femineis subditur arte choris,  
ut iam pollutus, pariunt quia crimina poenam,  
oscula uirginibus, terga daret gladiis.

The evil power of a woman's beauty is illustrated by examples taken from the O.T. Here the poet must be referring to Numbers, chapters 25 and 31, which describe how the Israelite host allowed itself to be captivated by the Moabite and Midianite women and at their instigation joined in the worship of Baal-peor.

377. *sanctus et uictor* AB, *sanctus et inuictus* Commire Bell. (approved by Schenkl and Baehr.), *sanctus ad haec u.* Bodl. corr., *sanctus <is> et u.* Ellis, *sanctus et <hic> u.* Purser.<sup>1</sup> E.'s conjecture has failed to find favour owing to the rarity of the form *is* in O.'s time.<sup>2</sup> Read rather *sanctus uel uictor* (*ūl < ut < et*); for *uel* = *et* cf. 1. 87 'omnia complexum uel semper in omnibus unum' (in 84 *uel-uel* = *et-et*). The comma after *miles* in 377 should be deleted.

379. *pollutus* 'nempe initiatione idololatrica' Delr., no doubt rightly. But what can be the meaning of *pariunt quia crimina poenam* (hitherto unchallenged)?<sup>3</sup> Pollution is not in itself a punishment, nor is the bestowal of kisses on maidens, etc.; the Israelites' punishment was in fact a plague. O. here wrote, I think, *pariunt quia crimina crimen*, a sentence which represents forcible Latin and excellent sense; the meaning is that the crime of licentiousness led to the crime of idolatry. In the case of the Israelites the evil consequence of lust is pollution, and the key-words, each at the beginning of its clause, are *sanctus* and *pollutus*, i.e. the *sanctus miles* becomes *pollutus*. In the *ut*-clause the whole weight rests on the participle *pollutus*, and the finite verb *daret* with its objects is of subsidiary importance; trans. 'whence followed pollution—for crimes beget crime—as he gave kisses to maidens, his back to the sword'. The conciseness of the description would occasion no difficulty to a reader familiar with the scriptural passages. I suggest, accordingly, that *crimen* dropped out by haplography (it would be especially liable to do so at the end of the line) and that *poenam* represents a clumsy attempt to fill up the gap (What do sins beget? Why,

<sup>1</sup> Purser considers that O. is still referring to Samson, who is dealt with in the preceding couplet, but apart from the general description's being inappropriate, the passage has then little point. Delrio (so Ellis and Bell.) is certainly right in tracing the passage to Num. 25 and 31.

<sup>2</sup> See Schmalz-Hofmann, p. 478.

<sup>3</sup> Bell. is completely at sea, translating 'dans l'espoir qu'ainsi déshonoré, — car la faute est toujours grosse du châtement, — il donnera des baisers', etc.

what but punishment?. Cf. Paul. Pell. 111 '(peccata) mihi maiorem parerent commissa reatum'.)

1. 381 tu quoque Leuitis tantum dilecta neq uxor.

The beauty of the Levite's wife also brought about ruin (Judges 19-20). The form *Leuitis* (*leuitis* B; the word is barely legible in A) has been misunderstood. It cannot be a dative plural, as Ellis (who lists the passage in his index s. *Leuitae*) appears to take it, for the sense so yielded—if sense it is—is not appropriate. Nor is the Latin reflected in Bell.'s rendering (p. xii) 'toi aussi, femme chérie du Lévite, sans que tu fusses épouse'. It has not been realized that *Leuitis* is a vocative, and we may translate 'Thou too, Levite woman, only a loved one [i.e. a concubine] and not a wife'. For clarity we should in accordance with E.'s practice print commas before and after *Leuitis*. This feminine form occurs in Prud. *Psych.* 502 'gentis Leuuitidis', but no other instance is cited.

1. 437-40 atque ut sis penitus sic corde ut corpore purus,  
ut nullum facias suspicione reum,  
da studium curans et semper prouidus opta,  
ut sit nulla tibi femina iuncta nimis.

438. This line yields no satisfactory sense. Bell. vainly translates 'afin que personne ne devienne coupable en te soupçonnant d'aimer', adding the note 'sens douteux, car le vers est bien peu naturel'. Purser, with evident misgivings, attempts 'so much so that you do not even suspect anyone to be guilty of illicit love', but the sense so squeezed from the line seems quite unnatural. The meaning must surely be that *you* are to be above suspicion. It seems to me that *facias* is a copyist's expansion of *fias* and that we should read

ut nulla fias suspicione reus.

On finding *nulla facias* . . . *reus*, the first stage in the corruption, a later copyist would be naturally tempted to alter to *nullum facias* . . . *reum*.<sup>1</sup>

As regards the punctuation of vv. 437-40, Purser seems right in printing one comma only, viz. after *curans* in 439. The order of clauses is thus chiasitic ('ut sis . . . da studium . . . opta ut sit').

1. 455 f. iam si corporeas calcaris corpore casto  
inlecebras, reliquum discute cordis onus.

The evils of *lasciua* have been dwelt on and the reader is now exhorted to abstain from *inuidia* and *auaritia*. For *corpore* (AB) Havet and Bell. ineptly substitute *pectore*, entirely missing the point of the lines. There is here, as often, a sharp contrast between *corpus* and *cor* (cf. 1. 437 'sic corde ut corpore purus'); the reader having trampled on the allurements of the body is now to dispel the sins of the soul. The introduction of *pectore* is ruinous and seems to be occasioned by a misunderstanding of the phrase *reliquum cordis onus*; the meaning is not, as Bell. translates, 'le reste du fardeau qui pèse sur ton cœur', but 'the remaining burden, viz. of the soul', or 'the burden of the soul, that remains', i.e. *inuidia*, etc. (cf. cases like Hor. *A.P.* 275 'ignotum tragicæ genus inuenisse Camenæ dicitur *Thespis*'). I do not see anything to object to, as do Havet and Bell., in the emphatic repetition *corporeas*—*corpore*.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 2. 33 f. 'nullum saeua reum faciat sententia, nullum | austero properes plectere iudicio', another passage in some need of amendment. *saeua* seems inappropriate to *sententia* (= 'opinion', 'judgement'), and Baehr. accordingly proposed *laeua*. The right reading must rather

be *saeua* ('malicious'); cf. Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 10. 268 'uulguis scaeuo rumore malignum' (*scaeuo* most codd., *seuo* B), 11. 44 'saeua . . . fabula' (= *rumor*), 19. 246 'saeua uoluntas' (*scaeuo* AD, *saeua* E).

Ma  
The  
tatis fo  
Ellis an  
nam c  
explan  
does n  
brough  
reflect  
The  
followi  
see Th  
tatis op  
606 'pa  
hinder  
and wi  
can, he  
end' (c  
Colum  
etc.);  
course

The  
the fa  
expans  
used in  
marat  
langua  
uirtuti  
illustra  
multit  
princip

Ava  
Ellis, h  
enough

<sup>1</sup> Ell  
interpre  
Pharisa  
dulæ  
uulguis  
modo  
Bell. ha  
pléta co

1. 475-82

haec (*inuidia*) postrema dedit crucis in ludibria Christum,  
 dum peragit liuor credulitatis opus,  
 et praeceps populus signa ac miracula rerum  
 obtutu cernit, pectore non recipit.  
 in tantum studiis furialibus improba cunctos  
 a uero in facinus uerterat inuidia,  
 ut non nescirent, sed nollent credere, quod tunc  
 esset per dominum glorificandus homo.

Matth. 27. 18 'sciebat enim (*Pilatus*) quod per inuidiam tradidissent eum'.

Though there can be little doubt as to the soundness of Delrio's correction *credulitatis* for *crudelitatis* (AB) in 476, the interpretation of this line is questionable indeed. Ellis and Bell. take *credulitas* in the sense of 'credulity'.<sup>1</sup> Delrio notes 'sic fidem appellat. nam crux opus fidei nostrae metonymicās, et hoc opus tribuitur Liuori . . .'. Neither explanation convinces. Purser seems nearer the mark: he is 'not sure that *credulitas* does not mean "faith"' and suggests the meaning may be that envy 'completed, brought to an end, the work that faith had begun'. Such a rendering does not, however, reflect the true meaning of *peragere*; and what was the work that faith had begun?

The key to the line lies in 479-82. It seems reasonably clear that *credere* in 481 is following up *credulitatis* in 476 and that the latter means 'belief' (as often in the eccl.—see *Thes.*; Purs. compares 1. 88 'corde pius credas, credulus ore roges', etc.); *credulitatis opus* I take to mean 'the working of belief' or 'the work of creating belief' (cf. 1. 606 'paci opus') in reference to the miracles. It will be seen from 479-82 that men were hindered from believing by envy, and such a sense is what we might expect to find, and what Purs. apparently considers is to be found, in 476. The expression *peragit opus* can, however, only mean 'brings a work to accomplishment, carries it through to the end' (cf. Suet. *Calig.* 21 'quorum operum . . . alterum peractum, omisum alterum est', Colum. 3. 10. 7 'laboris sui pensum', Virg. *Aen.* 4. 452 'inceptum', Juv. 13. 210 'conata', etc.); yet the *credulitatis opus*, far from being accomplished, was rudely arrested in its course.

The line does not appear to me to offer any satisfactory solution as it stands, and the fault must lie in *peragit*. Read rather *perdit* (*pergit* written in error and later expanded to *peragit* to govern *opus*), which gives us the required sense;<sup>2</sup> this verb is used in a like context some lines further, viz. 492 'innocuos quidquid dominus formarat in usus, haec (*auaritia*) male mutatis perdidit officiis'; we find very similar language too in Paul. Petric. 5. 46 'ne, quod contulerit meritum, iactantia perdat | et uirtutis opus uitiet praesumptio cordis'. The general sense of the passage is well illustrated in Lact. *Epit.* 40. 4 'ob haec miracula cum ad eum magna concurreret multitudo et, ut erat, dei filium et a deo missum crederet, repleti inuidia sacerdotes ac principes Iudaeorum, simul ira concitati . . . coierunt, ut eum occiderent'.

1. 493 f.

quid quereris diros portus uentosque furentes,  
 tristia famosis aequora naufragiis?

Avarice leads men to risk the perils of the seas. *portus* (AB), which is retained by Ellis, has been rightly suspected, but improperly emended; for Baehr. *motus* was good enough, for Havet and Bell. *fluctus*.<sup>3</sup> Purser works hard to defend *portus*; he considers

<sup>1</sup> Ellis comments '*credulitatis* Delr. quod sic interpretor, dum cruci figitur Christum propter Pharisaeorum inuidiam, non propter plebis credulae libidinem. nam ut nimis credulum est uulgi, Christum modo pro rege accipiebant, modo pro nequam et malefico interficiebant'. Bell. has 'quand la malignité de ses ennemis compléta ce qu'avait commencé leur crédulité'. The

passage remains unintelligible.

<sup>2</sup> In regard to metre it may be noted that O.'s poem contains many examples of two or more successive pentameters whose first-halves are spondaic; cf. 2. 342-54, where there are seven such lines in succeeding couplets.

<sup>3</sup> For Havet and Bell. nothing could be simpler than the transition from *fluctus* to *portus*; v. Bell.



that the expression *diros portus* represents a forcible oxymoron, 'a dreadful harbourage', and is used by O. either for rocks or for real harbours entry into which is endangered by storms; for the latter interpretation he compares Lucr. 1. 271 f. 'principio uenti uis uerberat incita portus | ingentisque ruit naus et nubila differt', where, however, the text is uncertain and the right reading may well be *pontum* (so Diels Ernout Bailey with Marullus for *cortus* OGO, *corpus* Q<sup>1</sup>, *portus* other codd.).<sup>1</sup> The manuscript reading remains, I consider, highly unconvincing, and I should read *dirum pontum* (miswritten *dirum portum* and later brought into alinement with the other plurals *uentos* and *aequora*).

1. 503-6      e terra genitum terrena in munera ferrum  
                   falcibus incuruum, uomeribus rigidum,  
                   in caedem et diras, bellorum crimina, mortes  
                   armamus contis missilibus gladiis.

505. *mortes* B, *mentes* A, *messes* Havet Bell. The expression *diras mentes*, which Purser defends as = 'monstrous thoughts', 'unnatural devisings', here almost 'savagery', is in itself unexceptionable (P. compares Virg. *Aen.* 2. 519), but its use in conjunction with *in caedem* seems entirely strange. P.'s objection to *mortes* as 'rather tame and tautological' does not allow for a type of pleonasm to be found in all periods of the language but particularly common in the late.<sup>2</sup> E. is surely justified in preferring B's reading.<sup>3</sup> Havet and Bell. have their own ideas.

506. *armamus* (AB), which is retained by both Ellis and Bell., yields no sense of any sort; it certainly cannot have that assigned it by Bell., viz. '... et nous en formons des épieux...', appropriate as it may be. Baehrens conjectures *aptamus*, which Purser approves. I suggest that O. rather wrote *formamus* (the loss of the line's initial letter<sup>4</sup> would inevitably produce *armamus*). We may compare Arnob. *Nat.* 7. 9 'quis in gladium formauit ferrum? non homo?' (cf. too Claud. Don. *Aen.* 7. 635 'omne ferrum uertebatur in gladios'). The datives *contis missilibus gladiis* are used for *in* with the accus. (cf. 1. 265 'formanda in membra redibit portio') and correspond to *falcibus* and *uomeribus* in 504 (as the phrase *in caedem et diras*... *mortes* corresponds to *terrena in munera*); for this construction with *formare* (of which the *Thes.* gives no example) cf. Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 19. 100 'ut (*Satanas*) Serapi sanctum formaret Ioseph' (for *in Serapim*); passages illuminating as regards the use of the dative are Claud. 21. 223 'in falcem curuet gladios' and Dracont. *Orest.* 398 'curuentur falcibus enses'.<sup>5</sup>

1. 527-30      scalpuntur gemmae similes, manus improba discit  
                   heu male mentitas assimulare manus,  
                   ut pater alterius factus credatur et heres  
                   non possit proprii filius esse patris.

A forged will results in a son's being deprived of his rightful inheritance. In 529,

p. 50 'la faute consistant à employer *p* pour *f* était facile à faire. Ainsi, au vers 213, il est probable, nous l'avons vu, que *fratrum* a été mal lu et changé en *proprii* [another specimen of Havet's wizardry]'.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I am not impressed by the passages adduced by E. L. B. Meurig Davies (*Mnemos.*, 1949, p. 72) in support of the reading *portus* in Lucr. l.c., viz. Pentad. *Fort.* 31 f. 'per mare iacta ratis pleno subit ostia uelo, | in portu mersa est per mare iacta ratis', and Sen. *Nat.* 3. 26. 2 'si crebrioribus uentis ostium caeditur et reuerberatur fluctu, amnis resistit'. Lucr. is referring to the power of the winds in general terms; in 273 he notes their effect on plains and in 274 on mountains; it is

difficult to believe that the poet would link harbours with plains and mountains as typical objects of the wind's fury. Neither the strained epigram of Pentadius nor Seneca's reference to river-mouths (which do no doubt receive their share of wind) offers support to *portus*.

<sup>2</sup> See Löfstedt, *Synt.* ii, p. 175 f. His observation on the liberties taken in the use of pleonasm, viz. 'sie sind oft weit grösser, als die kurz-sichtige Pedanterie der Kritiker hat anerkennen wollen', is not without point.

<sup>3</sup> See note and footnote<sup>5</sup> on 1. 3 above.

<sup>4</sup> See note and footnote<sup>3</sup> on 1. 597.

<sup>5</sup> In *Thes. s. curuo*, col. 1547. 76, *falcibus* is less naturally taken as an ablative.

where  
and P  
conder  
duces  
forger  
is gene  
is thou  
while t  
Plaut.

1. 5

592  
an Oxf  
that (n  
occur e  
weight  
contin  
*Epist.*  
being a  
(cf. Pa  
poem i  
prefer  
here in  
script.

1. 5

597-  
the wor  
that w  
pate,  
junctio  
initial l  
particu

UNI

<sup>1</sup> This  
reading a  
codex di  
of the Bo  
the actu

<sup>2</sup> See  
on 10. 6.  
largely in

where the manuscripts read *factus*, both Havet's substitution *falsus*, which Bell. adopts, and Purser's *fictus* seem to me unintelligible. *factus*, on the other hand, which P. condemns and about which Bell. says nothing, yields excellent sense. A forger produces a will, in which a deceased man is represented as leaving his property to the forger as being his son; as a result the true son is disinherited. The subject of *credatur* is general 'a man', i.e. the testator, with *factus* understand *esse*; trans. 'so that a man is thought to have become the father of another [i.e. not his hitherto recognized son], while the (true) son is unable to be his own father's heir'. For the use of *factus* cf. Plaut. *Epid.* 650 'quid? ego . . . huic frater factus (*sum*), dum intro eo atque exeo?'

1. 591 f. ipsa etenim ante deum non est peritura uoluntas,  
si bene non poterit, quae bene uel cupiet.

592. *uel cupiet* A, *uuelle cupit* B Rivinus Bell., *qui bene uel cupit* Schurtzfl. as from an Oxford cod.<sup>1</sup> Purser maintains that Bell. is right in following B, on the grounds that (1) the present tense is required in *cupit*, and (2) *uel* is awkward, and does not occur elsewhere in this sense in the poem. Neither objection seems to me to have any weight whatever. It may be replied that (1) the gnomic future is quite naturally continued in *cupiet*; cf. 1. 552, 572 'integra mox capiet, qui peritura dabit', 575, Hor. *Epist.* 1. 16. 65 'qui cupiet, metuet quoque', etc.,<sup>2</sup> and (2) *uel* (= *saltem*), so far from being awkward, actually improves the sentence; that this well-established use of *uel* (cf. Paul. Petric. 3. 8 'grandia si nequit effari, uel suaui dicet') occurs only once in the poem is scarcely of relevance. Accordingly, as the readings of A are in general to be preferred to those of B (*uuelle cupit* is a natural enough corruption), and A's reading is here in my view in itself the superior, E. seems fully justified in following this manuscript.

1. 593-600 hinc fuit ut dominus monitis felicibus omnes  
coniungi uellet pacis amore homines,  
et quae per sanctos laudauerat ante prophetas,  
discipulis proprio traderet ore suis,  
dum nihil iniustum, nil durum, nil uiolentum,  
nil leue, nil cupidum, nil graue, nil uarium,  
uel facere in rebus, uel uerbis dicere posset  
casto seruatus pectore pacis amor.

597. *dum* (AB) yields no convincing sense. The meaning which Bell. ascribes to the word in his chapter on language (p. 151), viz. 'puisque' 'parce que', is inappropriate; that which he ascribes to it in his translation, viz. 'déclarant que', while fully appropriate, is not one which this conjunction possesses. In place of *dum* we need a conjunction to introduce what must be the substance of Christ's teaching, viz. *quod*. The initial letter of *qd* (*quod*) may well have disappeared (the first letter of a line being particularly so liable)<sup>3</sup> and the resultant *d* taken to represent *dum*.

(To be concluded.)

A. HUDSON-WILLIAMS.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF WALES,  
ABERYSTWYTH.

<sup>1</sup> This is one of the few cases in which the reading ascribed by Schurtzfleisch to an Oxford codex differs from the correction in the margin of the Bodleian copy of Rivinus's edition or from the actual text of R. See Ellis, p. 202 f.

<sup>2</sup> See J. H. Waszink, *Tertull. De anim.*, note on 10. 6. But O.'s choice of tense was no doubt largely influenced by metrical considerations; an

instructive passage is 2. 119 f. 'nam quod tu dederas, mox conferet alter et alter: quod multi cupiunt, nemo diu tenuit'.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. 2. 207-69, where the initial letter of a number of hexameters is missing. So in 1. 506, where the manuscripts read *armamus*, I assume the disappearance of F and propose *formamus* (see note *ad l.*).

## NOTES ON DELPHIC ORACLES

1.

Ἡετίων, οὗτις σε τίει πολύτιτον ἔοντα.  
 Λάβδα κύει, τέξει δ' ὀλοοίτροχον· ἐν δὲ πεσεῖται  
 ἀνδράσι μουνάρχοισι, δικαίῳσει δὲ Κόρινθον.

(Hdt. 5. 92β; Oenom. *ap.* Eus. *PE.* 5. 29, 224c; *AP.* 14. 86.)

Not only τίει and πολύτιτον but also, probably, οὗτις σε play on the name Ἡετίων. Why does the oracle designate Labda's child as ὀλοοίτροχον? The explanation is to be found in *Il.* 13. 137 ὀλοοίτροχος ὡς ἀπὸ πέτρης, the boulder here being Cypselus of Petra, whose parentage and place of origin are obliquely alluded to in the first line of the parallel oracle to the Corinthians (Hdt. *ibid.*) αἰετὸς ἐν πέτρῃσι κύει. Oracles are akin to riddles as a literary genre, and this response is exactly in the manner of a γρίφος, depending for its point on literary, especially Homeric, reminiscence. Compare with this the reply given by the Clarian Apollo (Oenom. *ap.* Eus. *PE.* 5. 22, 214a)

ἔστιν ἐν Τρηχίνος αἴῃ κῆπος Ἡρακλήϊος,  
 πάντ' ἔχων θάλλοντα, πᾶσι δρεπόμενος πανημιῶν,  
 οὐδ' ὀλιζοῦται βέβριθε δ' ὑδάτεσσιν διηνεκές,

which Oenomaus thought to interpret as referring to Hesiod (*Op.* 289 ff.)

τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς προπάρειθε θεοὶ ἰδρῶτα ἔθικαν  
 ἀθάνατοι· μικρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος ὀϊμος ἐς αὐτὴν  
 καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον.

If an ancient critic could catch an echo of τρηχὺς in Τρηχίνος, and infer that his attention was being directed to a famous passage of Hesiod, it is perhaps permissible to see a further literary allusion in the Delphic oracle to Croesus beginning *Λυδὲ γένος, πολλῶν βασιλεῦ, μέγα νήπιε Κροῖσε* (Hdt. 1. 85). The only other instance of μέγα νήπιε occurring at this place in the hexameter appears to be Hesiod's rebuke to his brother (*Op.* 286): μέγα νήπιε Πέρση. A certain brusqueness of tone, and a familiarity tinged with contempt, are characteristic of many Delphic responses. It is, however, one thing for Hesiod to address Perses thus, and quite another for Apollo to use the same words to the most generous of all his oracle's benefactors. Is he conveying a veiled warning against the Persian?

2. In the first oracle to the Athenians before Salamis (Hdt. 7. 140; Oenom. *ap.* Eus. *PE.* 5. 24. 216b; *AP.* 14. 92) the sensationalism of the response, with its opening rhetorical question, its violent fluctuations in number and tense, and its piling up of the agony by means of antithesis and anaphora, has tended to distract attention from the last line. Yet the words ἀλλ' ἴτον ἐξ ἀδύτοιο are dramatically the climax and recall the formula ἐξιθι ναοῦ applied by Apollo to murderers who enter his temple while still under the pollution of their crime.<sup>1</sup> Why are the Athenians addressed in these terms? The response is completely pro-Persian in tone. It may well have been part of Persian propaganda that the destruction of Athens was not merely Persian vengeance for Athenian participation in the Ionian Revolt and for Marathon, but also divine retribution for Athens' disregard of the sacrosanctity of the Persian heralds whom she put to death before the Marathon campaign. Hdt. 7. 133 ὁ τι δὲ τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι ταῦτα ποιήσασι τοὺς κήρυκας συνήνευκε ἀνεθέλγον γενέσθαι, οὐκ ἔχω εἶπαι, πλὴν ὅτι σφέων ἡ χώρα καὶ ἡ πόλις ἐδηιώθη... is clearly aware of such an interpretation of events, though he rejects it.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the oracles quoted in Gal. *Protr.* 23 (to the murderer of Archilochus), and in Ael. *VH.* 3. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Contrast Paus. 3. 12. 7, who follows a different tradition.



3. ὑμῖν δ', ὦ Σπάρτης οἰκήτορες εὐρυχόροιο,  
 ἡ μέγα ἄστυ ἐρικυδές ὑπ' ἀνδράσι Περσεΐδῃσι  
 πέρσεται, ἡ τὸ μὲν οὐχί, ἀφ' Ἑρακλέους δὲ γενέθλης  
 πενθήσει βασιλῇ φθίμενον Λακεδαιμόνος οὖρος.  
 οὐ γὰρ τὸν ταύρων σχήσει μένος οὐδὲ λεόντων  
 ἀντιβίην· Ζηνὸς γὰρ ἔχει μένος· οὐδὲ ἔφημι  
 σχήσεσθαι, πρὶν τῶνδ' ἕτερον διὰ πάντα δάσσηται.

(Hdt. 7. 220; Oenom. *ap. Eus. PE.* 5. 25, 219b; *AP.* 14. 96.)

Line 2 has been emended because of the harshness of the synzesis ἄστυ ἐρικυδές. In *C.Q.* xxiii (1939), pp. 163 ff. ('An Inelegant Greek Verse') C. J. Todd rightly defends the reading,<sup>1</sup> and supports his argument by rough and defective hexameters mostly derived from inscriptions. He misses, however, the most relevant parallel, O. Kern, *Die Inschr. v. Magnesia* 1 d 49 καὶ Μυκάλης ὄρος αἰπὴ ἀπεναντίον Ἐνδυμίωνος, from an oracle which can hardly, it is true, be authentic, but may well be of Delphic provenance, or which had, at least, been approved by the Delphic authorities.

Line 3 πέρσεται, the reading in Oenom. *ap. Eus.*, seems clearly preferable to πέρβεται. A future is wanted to balance πενθήσει, and πέρσεται much improves the play upon words with Πέρσαι, Περσεΐδαι, which is clearly the speaker's intention. The future middle of this verb with passive force is as old as *Il.* 24. 729. This oracle is oddly overlooked by H. N. Couch in *A.J.Ph.* lii (1931), pp. 270 ff. ('Three puns on the root of πέρβω in the *Persae* of Aeschylus'), who notes the familiar Aeschylean echo in *Pers.* 84 of Συριηγενὲς ἄρμα διώκων (orac. *ap. Hdt.* 7. 140), and hints at further oracular influence in the play. Yet there can be little doubt that this response was the inspiration of two of the passages in Aeschylus that he analyses (*Pers.* 65 and 176-8).

This oracle is hardly a genuine response, though it may well emanate from Delphi. The forecast of the death of a Spartan king, and the broad hint in l. 5 that he was, in fact, Leonidas, strongly suggest a date after Thermopylae. The phrase Λακεδαιμόνος οὖρος is sufficiently unusual, and sufficiently close to Κέκροπος οὖρος in the second response to the Athenians before Salamis (Hdt. 7. 141), to suggest that the same hand may have been at work in both. The roughness of the versification and the accusative βασιλῇ<sup>2</sup> are symptoms of hasty workmanship. The response may have been composed immediately after the news of Salamis had reached Delphi, when the oracle was making a rapid change of front.

4. Βάττε <τὸ> πρόσθε κακόν, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἐσθλὸν ἐρευνᾷς),  
 ἔρχεο, λείψ' ἄλιαν χώραν, ἡπειρος ἀμείνων  
 ἡῶος. πρότερον δόλον ἔκβαλε † πείθει πείθων †  
 στερρόν γῆν δόσιως ἦν μισεῖ † πολλὴν † ἀθεμίστως.  
 οἶά τ' ἀνὴρ ἔρξει τοῖον τέλος αὐτὸν ἰκάνει.

(Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 10; Mened. *FGrH.* iii. 270 F 6.)

The corruption of the text is too deep-seated to be remedied easily. πείθει πείθων (l. 3) looks like desperate dittography to fill a gap at the end of the line. πολλὴν (l. 4) is intrusive, and may have come from the preceding line. We suggest

πρότερον δόλον ἔκβαλε· πείθε'· Ἀπόλλων  
 στερρόν γῆν δόσιωσεν εἴην· μισεῖς ἀθεμίστως.

'Be persuaded. It is the desert that Apollo hallowed as his own. Your hatred is wicked.' The asyndeton is very pronounced, though the staccato effect of l. 2 may have been continued in ll. 3 and 4. But any restoration is bound to be tentative.

The last line plays on the name of Cyrene's founder, and can be paraphrased ἄριστα ἔρξων Ἀριστοτέλης εἴσει. F. Benedict's suggestion (*De oraculis ab Herodoto*

<sup>1</sup> H. Diels briefly upholds the traditional text in *Sibyllinische Blätter* 60, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> An intrusive Delphic dialect form? If so, it is unparalleled in the extant verse oracles.

*commemoratis*, p. 41) that Aristoteles was a name given to Battus, the founder of Cyrene, on the successful accomplishment of his enterprise, seems exactly the reverse of the truth, but he may be right in thinking that Pindar uses the name with stress on its meaning in *Pyth.* 5. 87 ff. τοὺς Ἀριστοτέλης ἀγαγε ναυσὶ θααῖς ἀλὸς βαθεῖαν κέλευθον ἀνοίγων. Compare *Pyth.* 5. 60 ff. ὁ δ' ἀρχαγέτας ἔδωκ' Ἀπόλλων θήρας αἰνῶ φόβῳ, ὄφρα μὴ ταμίᾳ Κυράνας ἀτελὴς γένοιτο μαντεύμασιν, and it becomes probable that Pindar had this oracle in mind in both passages.

5. αὐτός σοι φράζει ἐκατήβολος· ἀλλὰ συνίει.  
οὗτος μὲν Ταφίασσος ἀνήροτος, ἦδε δὲ Χαλκίς,  
ἦδε δὲ Κουρήτων . . . ἡ ἱερὰ χθών,  
αἶδε δ' Ἐχινάδες εἰσί· πολὺς δ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ πόντος.  
οὕτω σ' οὐκ ἂν φημι Λακινίου ἀκρου ἀμαρτεῖν  
οὐδ' ἱερὰς Κριμισῆς οὐδ' Αἰσάρου ποταμοῖο.

(Diod. Sic. 17. 1.)

Oldfather's proposal<sup>1</sup> to read Ταφίασσος for Τάφιός τοι of the manuscripts in l. 2 seems certainly right. What of the gap in l. 3? Krebs suggested αἰχμητῶν ἱερὰ, but this is hardly in keeping with these very factual sailing instructions. The natural supplement is a proper name, and the simplest solution is to read: ἦδε δὲ Κουρήτων Πλευρωνία, ἡ ἱερὰ χθών. Cf. Str. 10. 2. 4, § 451 . . . ῥεῖ δ' οὐ διὰ τῆς Κουρητικῆς κατ' ἀρχάς, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ αὐτὴ τῇ Πλευρωνίᾳ.

H. W. PARKE.

D. E. W. WORMELL.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

<sup>1</sup> P.W. s.v. 'Taphiassos', iv. A. 2255.

## VIRGIL, CATALEPTON 5. 1-2.

In *C.Q.* xliii (1949), p. 39, Mr. J. H. Quincey quotes the opening lines of *Catalepton* 5 as,

Ite hinc, inanes, ite, rhetorum ampullae,  
inflata rhoso\* non Achaico verba,

and adds, 'the second line is corrupt and no satisfactory emendation has been proposed'.

The MS. readings are: *rhorso* B, *roso* Mu, om. in lacuna Ar. In face of these *voces nihili* many have fallen back on the *rore* of the Aldine edition of 1517. But this does not really help, for one does not inflate with dew: orators are not dew-bags, but wind-bags. It occurred to me some years ago that what is needed is some word meaning breath or wind to go with *inflata*, and that in view of the *rh* in *rhorso* it was probably a Greek word which a scribe had failed to recognize. I conjectured ῥοῖζω, and found subsequently that this had been proposed by K. Münscher in *Hermes*, xlvii (1912), pp. 153-4. ῥοῖζος, used of any rushing sound, is applied to speech by Philostratus (*V. Soph.* 2. 15, p. 98, Kayser), and by Pollux (6. 148). It is easy to see how *rhoezo* could degenerate into *rhoeso-rhoso-roso*.

This emendation has been adopted by Rostagni in his *Virgilio Minore* (1933); but since it seems to have escaped the notice not only of Mr. Quincey, but of Mr. Fairclough in his Loeb edition (1930), and of various writers on Virgil since 1912, it may seem worth while to draw attention to it, especially as the passage is so often quoted.

L. P. WILKINSON.

KING'S COLLEGE,  
CAMBRIDGE.

## ARISTOTLE'S THEORY OF THE FORMATION OF METALS AND MINERALS

THE TWOFOLD EXHALATION. Aristotle explains in Book I of the *Meteorologica* (341<sup>b</sup>6 ff.) that the heat of the sun causes the earth to give off an exhalation (*ἀναθυμίασις*), which is of two kinds. One kind, derived from the moisture within the earth and on its surface, is a moist vapour (cf. *De Sensu* 443<sup>a</sup>26-7), 'potentially like water' (340<sup>b</sup>28-9); the other, which comes from the earth itself, is hot, dry, and smoky, highly combustible 'like a fuel' (*οἷον ὑπέκκαυμα*, 341<sup>b</sup>18-19), 'the most inflammable of substances' (341<sup>b</sup>16-17), 'potentially like fire' (340<sup>b</sup>29), and compounded of Air and Earth (*De Sensu* 443<sup>a</sup>21-2, 27-8).

The moist exhalation, then, is a vapour. The dry exhalation, on the other hand, is less easy to envisage, as Aristotle himself admits (341<sup>b</sup>15), but in some of its states it is fiery and in others not unlike a gas.

Books I-III of the *Meteorologica* are largely devoted to a consideration of the phenomena caused by the two exhalations.<sup>1</sup> For instance, rain, dew, frost and snow are attributed to the moist, vaporous kind; shooting stars, thunder, lightning, wind and earthquakes to the dry, smoky kind. At the end of Book III (378<sup>a</sup>15 ff.) comes the passage which is the subject of this paper. Here Aristotle describes what happens when the two exhalations are 'imprisoned within parts of the earth'. Two substances are formed in the earth, 'fossiles'<sup>2</sup> (*τὰ ὀρυκτά*) and metals (*τὰ μεταλλεύόμενα*), and of these the metals are produced from the vaporous exhalation and the 'fossiles' by the dry one. The formation of the metals is clear in principle, but obscure in detail. On the other hand, the part played by the dry exhalation in producing the 'fossiles' is obscure in every respect and will be considered later, although it is treated first by Aristotle himself.

THE FORMATION OF THE METALS, 378<sup>a</sup>26 ff.: *τῆς δ' ἀναθυμιάσεως τῆς ἀτμιδώδους, ὅσα μεταλλεύεται, καὶ ἔστιν ἡ χυτὰ ἢ ἐλατὰ, οἷον σίδηρος, χρυσός, χαλκός. ποιεῖ δὲ ταῦτα πάντα ἡ ἀναθυμίασις ἢ ἀτμιδώδης ἐγκατακλειομένη, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τοῖς λίθοις, διὰ ξηρότητα εἰς ἐν συνθλιβομένη καὶ πηγνυμένη, οἷον ἡ δρόσος ἢ πάχνη, ὅταν ἀποκριθῇ. ἐνταῦθα δὲ πρὶν ἀποκριθῆναι γεννᾶται ταῦτα. διὸ ἔστι μὲν ὡς ὕδωρ ταῦτα, ἔστιν δ' ὡς οὐ· δυνάμει μὲν γὰρ ἡ ὕλη ὕδατος ἦν, ἔστι δ' οὐκέτι, οὐδ' ἐξ ὕδατος γενομένου διὰ τι πάθος, ὥσπερ οἱ χυμοί· οὐδὲ γὰρ οὕτω γίνεταί τὸ μὲν χαλκός τὸ δὲ χρυσός, ἀλλὰ πρὶν γενέσθαι παγείσης τῆς ἀναθυμιάσεως ἕκαστα τούτων ἔστιν. διὸ καὶ πυροῦνται πάντα καὶ γῆν ἔχει· ξηρὰν γὰρ ἔχει ἀναθυμίασιν· ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς μόνος οὐ πυροῦται.*<sup>3</sup>

(a) *τῆς δ' ἀναθυμιάσεως . . . ἐν τοῖς λίθοις*. By metals Aristotle means all those substances which are mined and which, unlike the 'fossiles', are fusible or malleable (*ἡ χυτὰ ἢ ἐλατὰ*). As instances he mentions iron, gold, and copper, but a fuller list would have included silver, tin (388<sup>a</sup>13), and probably lead (389<sup>a</sup>7).<sup>4</sup> These are all formed by

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle speaks sometimes of a twofold exhalation, sometimes of two exhalations.

<sup>2</sup> This is E. W. Webster's rendering of the term in the Oxford translation and is convenient, however archaic. The distinction between 'things dug' (*τὰ ὀρυκτά*) and 'things mined' (*τὰ μεταλλεύόμενα*) seems at first sight arbitrary. Aristotle merely uses the two terms as labels for distinguishing two groups of natural substances. They do not imply a subtle difference between digging

and mining as such.

<sup>3</sup> The text is that of F. H. Fobes, Cambridge, Mass., 1919.

<sup>4</sup> Book IV of the *Meteorologica* expounds the formation and properties of homogeneous substances in general and contains several references to metals and stones which are of value. Where there is no further indication, the references in this paper are to the *Meteorologica*.



the moist exhalation<sup>1</sup> when it is trapped underground, and particularly if it is trapped in rocks (καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τοῖς λίθοις). This, no doubt, is meant partly to explain why metals have to be extracted from ores. Similarly, according to Plato, *Tim.* 59b, metals are formed by the percolation of 'fusible water' (χυρὰ ὕδατα) through rock.

(b) διὰ ξηρότητα . . . γεννᾶται ταῦτα. The exhalation is compressed (εἰς ἐν συνθλιβομένη, that is, condensed) by the dryness of the rocks and congealed or solidified (πηγνυμένη), 'just like dew or hoar-frost, when it has been separated. But in this case, the metals are formed before it has been separated.'

This is a difficult passage. The moist exhalation condenses when it comes into contact with the dry rock, and is there congealed into metals, presumably by cold. (The point will be discussed below.) Aristotle then writes 'like dew or hoar-frost'. But this is misleading because hoar-frost does not condense (347<sup>a</sup>13 ff.) and dew does not congeal. What he might have said was 'condensed like dew and congealed like hoar-frost'. However, the real object of the comparison is to mark a contrast. Unlike either dew or hoar-frost, the metals are formed before it (i.e. the moist exhalation) has been separated from the dry exhalation. This is Alexander's explanation<sup>2</sup> and is no doubt correct because the metals 'contain the dry exhalation' (378<sup>b</sup>3-4). There is nothing strange in this conception since normally the two exhalations are closely associated, or rather 'mixed'<sup>3</sup>.

'Compressed by the dryness of the rocks and congealed.' Does Aristotle mean that the dryness of the rocks not only condenses but also congeals and solidifies the moist exhalation? Probably not. In fact, he has already implied as much by stating that the metals are 'fusible or malleable' (378<sup>a</sup>27). By 'fusible', of course, he means 'melted by heat'. 'Gold, silver, copper, tin, lead . . . are of water';<sup>4</sup> for all of them are melted by heat' (389<sup>a</sup>7 ff.). Now Aristotle accepted as axiomatic the principle that 'melting', 'dissolution' (τῆξις), and 'hardening', 'congealing', 'solidification' (πῆξις) must be due in every case to opposite causes; furthermore, he supposed both to be caused either by dry heat or by cold (382<sup>b</sup>31 ff.). Consequently if gold, silver, etc., are melted by heat, they must have been hardened by cold. The same is true of iron, which is malleable rather than fusible, that is, it is normally softened by heat and melted only by excessive heat (383<sup>a</sup>29 ff.); iron, too, must have been hardened by cold.

(c) διὸ ἐστὶ μὲν ὡς ὕδωρ ταῦτα . . . ἕκαστα τούτων ἐστίν. Because the moist exhalation composing the metals contains an admixture of the dry exhalation, the metals cannot revert to water (as, for instance, hoar-frost can). 'Their matter was potentially that of water, but is so no longer. Nor, like savours, do the metals come from water which has been transformed into them by being affected in some way (οὐδ' ἐξ ὕδατος γενομένου διὰ τι πάθος, ὥσπερ οἱ χυμοί). Copper and gold were not formed in this way either. No; each of the metals exists because the exhalation congealed before water could be formed' (378<sup>a</sup>33-378<sup>b</sup>3).

The formation of the metals differs from that of dew and hoar-frost. It also differs from that of savours. According to Aristotle (*De Sensu* 441<sup>b</sup>17 ff.), natural savours are produced when water filters through earthy matter and thus acquires a new quality. This is the πάθος which water must undergo in order to be transformed into a savour. Aristotle warns us not to think of the generation of the metals in this way. He does not want us to suppose that the moist exhalation is first condensed into water, which is then transformed into metals by the addition of some other ingredient. On the

<sup>1</sup> It has often been pointed out that this theory of a common origin of all metals encouraged the alchemists in their efforts to transmute base metals into gold. There is no reason to suppose that such a possibility ever occurred to Aristotle.

<sup>2</sup> *Comm. in Meteor.* ed. Hayduck, p. 177, 27-33.

<sup>3</sup> 358<sup>a</sup>21-2, μεμυγμένης δ' οὐσης, ὥσπερ εἰπομεν, τῆς τε ἀτμιδώδους ἀναθυμιάσεως καὶ τῆς ξηρᾶς.

<sup>4</sup> Because the moist exhalation is potentially a kind of water.

contr  
tion,  
metal  
'beca

(d)  
conta  
Since  
as Al  
Olym  
had a  
Alexa

Pe  
to exp  
cally,  
quant  
great  
this r

Th  
the d  
comes  
not fo  
earth  
excep

Th  
functi  
tion in  
the m  
exhala

An  
author  
been m  
with t  
ἀναθυ  
σανδα  
ὀρυκτ  
ολον τ  
ing th  
realga

<sup>1</sup> *Com*  
<sup>2</sup> Th  
writes  
ξηράν τ  
ὅταν π  
agreem  
with m  
Holmys  
Congela  
footnot  
(*De Re*  
ralis S  
Both Z  
i, p. 51

contrary, the ingredients, the moist exhalation plus an admixture of the dry exhalation, are there from the start, and are condensed and hardened together. Just as the metals can no longer revert to actual water, so, too, they never came from actual water 'because the exhalation congealed before water could be formed'.

(d) διὸ καὶ πυροῦνται . . . οὐ πυροῦνται. 'Hence all the metals are affected by fire and contain earth, for they all contain the dry exhalation. Only gold is unaffected by fire.' Since the metals contain earthy matter, exposure to fire causes them to produce dross, as Alexander points out (op. cit., p. 178. 6-10), and incidentally to change colour. Olympiodorus adds that for the same reason they rust (ῥυθίζονται).<sup>1</sup> No doubt Aristotle had all these facts in mind. The exception is gold; presumably pure gold is meant, as Alexander observes.

Possibly the presence of earthy matter in different proportions may have served to explain the difference between the baser and the more precious metals. Theoretically, they could all have been arranged in a series, with gold, containing the smallest quantity of the dry exhalation, at one end of the scale, and iron, containing the greatest, at the other. (Iron contains a large proportion of earthy matter and for this reason can be softened, but not easily melted: 383°29 ff.)

The moist exhalation, then, is the material of the metals. Along with portions of the dry exhalation it is trapped underground, where it condenses, particularly if it comes into contact with rocks, and then hardens, probably through cold. Metals are not formed like dew or hoar-frost, still less like savours. Because the metals contain earthy matter, they cannot revert to water, and for the same reason they are, with the exception of pure gold, affected by fire.

THE FORMATION OF THE 'FOSSILES'. It has always been readily assumed that the function of the dry exhalation in forming the 'fossiles' is like that of the moist exhalation in forming the metals. The moist exhalation is predominantly the *matter* of which the metals are formed. What could be more natural than to suppose that the dry exhalation is similarly the *matter* of which the 'fossiles' are composed?

And yet this view can hardly be the correct one, although it rests on excellent authority<sup>2</sup> and has the advantage of symmetry. In fact, its symmetry has probably been responsible for its wide acceptance; or, to be more exact, its symmetry coupled with the obscurities in Aristotle's all too brief statement (378<sup>a</sup>21-6): ἡ μὲν οὖν ξηρὰ ἀναθυμίασις ἐστὶν ἣ τις ἐκπυροῦσα ποιεῖ τὰ ὀρυκτὰ πάντα, ὅσον λίθων τε γένη τὰ ἄττητα καὶ σανδαράκην καὶ ὤχραν καὶ μίλτον καὶ θεῖον καὶ τὰλλα τὰ τοιαῦτα. τὰ δὲ πλείστα τῶν ὀρυκτῶν ἐστὶν τὰ μὲν κονία κεχρωματισμένη, τὰ δὲ λίθος ἐκ τοιαύτης γεγενῆσθαι συστάσεως, ὅσον τὸ κιννάβαρι.<sup>3</sup> 'It is the dry exhalation, then, that forms all the "fossiles" by burning them (?), as for example those kinds of stones which cannot be melted and realgar, ochre, ruddle, sulphur, and other things of that kind. Most of the "fossiles"

<sup>1</sup> *Comm. in Meteor.* ed. Stüve, p. 270. 24-5.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Alexander (op. cit., p. 177. 15-18) writes τὰ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν ὀρυκτὰ εἶναι, ἃ ποιεῖν τὴν ξηρὰν τε καὶ καπνώδη ἀναθυμίασιν συνισταμένην, ὅταν πλεονάσῃ. Olympiodorus is in substantial agreement (see below). The view was adopted, with modifications, by the Arabs (see E. J. Holmyard and D. C. Mandeville, *Avicennae de Congelatione et Conglutinatione Lapidum*, p. 35, footnote), and is restated by Iacobus Zabarella (*De Rebus Naturalibus*, Cologne, 1594, *De Naturalis Scientiae Constitutione*, chap. 30, p. 85b). Both Zeller (*Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics*, i, p. 515) and Ross (*Aristotle*, p. 111) appear to

accept the tradition. Thus Ross: '... These are divided into the metals, which are formed by the moist exhalation, and the "fossiles", formed by the dry.' 'By' is ambiguous, but the two processes are obviously supposed to be analogous. W. Capelle, who refers to the topic in his article 'Meteorologie' (*P.W. Suppl.* vi, col. 341), unfortunately does not discuss it. J. L. Ideler in his edition of the *Meteorologica* allows Alexander and Olympiodorus to speak for Aristotle. Translators have sometimes come nearer to the truth than the commentators.

<sup>3</sup> The text, as before, is that of F. H. Fobes.

are either coloured powder-ash (?) or, like cinnabar, a stone formed of a similar composition.'

There is much in this admittedly difficult passage which points to one conclusion alone, that the dry exhalation is not the material cause of the 'fossiles', as commentators have usually supposed, but their efficient cause, supplying the heat which forms them.

(a) To take a comparatively simple detail first: the 'fossiles' include not only certain minerals such as realgar, ochre, ruddle, sulphur, and cinnabar, but also those kinds of stones which cannot be melted.

Now if the dry exhalation is to be regarded as the material of the 'fossiles', an immense disproportion in bulk must exist between its products and those of the moist exhalation, when either is trapped underground. The minerals such as ochre, ruddle, etc., might by themselves be supposed to be roughly equivalent in bulk to the metals. But what of the stones which cannot be melted? Aristotle nowhere gives a list of such stones, but it seems likely that he must have included under them at least the crystalline limestones, for it was a familiar and undeniable fact that such stones, when burnt, did not melt, but turned into lime.<sup>1</sup> Hence some of the most important mountain masses known to Aristotle must have been classed among stones that cannot be melted. To provide material for these, the dry exhalation must have accumulated underground in such quantities as would altogether have upset the balance which was clearly assumed to exist between it and the moist exhalation. (See, for example, 360<sup>b</sup>15 ff.)

(b) An even plainer hint as to the truth lies in the word *ἐκπυρούσα*. The dry exhalation forms the 'fossiles' by burning them. It is not clear what is to be understood as the object of *ἐκπυρούσα*, but it is probably the 'fossiles' themselves, or, rather, the material of which they are formed.<sup>2</sup> One thing at least is certain: *ἐκπυρούσα* must be active in meaning. It cannot be intransitive ('catching fire'), as Olympiodorus seems to think,<sup>3</sup> for in the writings of Aristotle and Theophrastus at least there is no trace of such a use.<sup>4</sup>

Thus the dry exhalation supplies not the matter, but the heat which forms the 'fossiles'. We have already seen (p. 141) that it is highly inflammable. When set in motion, it easily ignites and so produces shooting stars, thunder, and lightning (341<sup>b</sup> ff., 369<sup>a</sup> ff.). Within the earth it will similarly ignite if it is set in motion (367<sup>a</sup>9 ff., with Webster's note), and this is 'the cause of the fire that is generated within the earth', for 'there exists within the earth much heat and fire' (360<sup>a</sup>5-6). When the exhalation is in this fiery state, it must tend to rise to the earth's surface. But if in so doing it is trapped underground and brought into contact with the right materials, it will by combustion transform these materials into 'fossiles'.

(c) The text still provides one serious obscurity. Most of the 'fossiles' are *κονία κεχρωματισμένη*. What is this? In Attic prose *κονία*, which has the same root as *κόνης*, dust, means

<sup>1</sup> Theophrastus, *De Lapidibus*, § 9.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire translates *ἡ μὲν οὖν ξηρὰ ἀναθυμίασις κτλ.* 'L'exhalaison sèche, en brûlant les matières, produit tous les minéraux, etc.' Similarly E. W. Webster (Oxford translation) has 'the heat of the dry exhalation is the cause of all "fossiles"'. But neither draws attention to the significance of his rendering.

<sup>3</sup> Olympiodorus (op. cit., p. 269. 4) takes *ἐκπυρούσα* as equivalent to *ἐκπυρουμένη καὶ περιφρυγνόμενη*, i.e. the dry exhalation forms the 'fossiles' 'by being burnt and parched'. This im-

plies that the dry exhalation is the material cause of the 'fossiles' and is an obvious travesty of Aristotle's language. It is just possible, however, that Olympiodorus had not completely made up his mind as to the true solution. Compare an earlier remark of his, *ὅπο μὲν γὰρ τῆς καπνώδους ἀναθυμιάσεως γίνεται τὰ καλούμενα ὑπὸ Ἀριστοτέλους Ὀρυκτά* (op. cit., p. 266. 5-6), where *ὅπο*, strictly interpreted, must mean that the dry exhalation is the efficient cause.

<sup>4</sup> Generally speaking, regular verbs in *-όω* are transitive.



- (1) Fine powdery ash (such as was used as a detergent). In this sense it is often associated with τέφρα, which also means 'ash', 'cinders' (358<sup>b9</sup>, 359<sup>b7</sup>), and the two sometimes appear to be used interchangeably, as in 357<sup>a31-2</sup> and 357<sup>b2</sup> and in *Probl.* 25, 8. 938<sup>b25</sup>. Hesychius gives σποδός as a synonym for both. τέφρα was probably coarser and less pure than κονία. Hence κυκησίτεφος κονία is supplied by the dishonest bathman in Aristophanes, *Frogs* 713.
- (2) Lye, an alkaline fluid made by pouring water through ashes (384<sup>a13</sup>, 389<sup>a10</sup>, 27; cf. Pollux 7. 40).
- (3) Quicklime (Theophrastus, *De Lap.*, §§ 9 and 68).

Of these (2) can be rejected at once because the 'fossiles' are not liquid, while (3) is not likely to be correct because the quicklime grows hot when it is moistened, whereas the 'fossiles' do not.

We are left with (1). In this case, κονία κεχρωματισμένη must be coloured powder-ash, into which the raw material of the 'fossiles', presumably earth, is transformed by the heat and fire coming from the dry exhalation.

This interpretation of ἐκπυροῦσα and κονία κεχρωματισμένη is supported by an earlier passage (359<sup>b4</sup> ff.), which seems to have been neglected in this connexion. Here Aristotle is discussing the origin of salt streams and springs. 'Most of these, we must suppose, were once hot. Then the fire originally in them was extinguished, but the earth through which they percolate still remains like ashes and cinders (ὅσον κονίαν καὶ τέφραν). There exist in many places springs and streams with all kinds of flavours, and the cause of all these flavours must be the fire that is or was present (reading ἐγγενομένην with Webster). For according as earth is burnt in a greater or a lesser degree, so it takes on every conceivable kind and shade of flavour (καομένη γὰρ ἡ γῆ τῷ μᾶλλον καὶ ἥττον παντοδαπὰς λαμβάνει μορφὰς καὶ χροὰς χυμῶν, 359<sup>b10-12</sup>). It becomes full of στυπτηρία (alum) and κονία (here possibly potash) and other substances of the kind; and the fresh water which percolates through them is changed in character.'

Several important points should be noticed:

- (1) The process occurs underground (for the waters percolate, διηθοῦνται), and this is where the formation of 'fossiles' takes place.
- (2) Here earth is reduced by fire into a kind of κονία καὶ τέφρα. Compare with this κονία κεχρωματισμένη. It is true that fire, and not the dry exhalation, is the agent in this passage, but there is no inconsistency since, as we have already seen (p. 144), the dry exhalation is the source of the fire which exists within the earth.
- (3) In this passage, earth exposed to fire in varying degrees assumes every kind of flavour. In the 'fossiles' passage the emphasis is not on flavour but on colour (κεχρωματισμένη). This is only natural, because most of the 'fossiles' mentioned by name are in fact brightly coloured and were used in painting.<sup>1</sup> May not Aristotle have supposed that exposure to fire causes earth to assume not only various flavours but also various colours?

Looked at in this way, the two passages supplement each other. The fire and heat from the dry exhalation form the 'fossiles' by reducing earth to the consistency of fine ash and perhaps causing it (although this is less certain) to take on bright colours. Those of the 'fossiles' which are stones must furthermore have been hardened by this heat (383<sup>b10</sup> ff.). This is as far as the evidence allows us to go.

Elsewhere in the *Meteorologica* (384<sup>b30-4</sup>) there is a statement which might appear to contradict this view: 'Thus homogeneous bodies, both in plants and animals, and likewise the metals (τὰ μεταλλεύόμενα), such as gold, silver, and the rest, are composed of water and earth—that is, water and earth and the exhalations from each of them

<sup>1</sup> Realgar, ochre, ruddle, and cinnabar. See Theophr. *De Lap.*, §§ 50, 51, 58.

when they are trapped underground (τῆς ἀναθυμιάσεως τῆς ἐκατέρου ἐγκατακλειομένης), as has been said elsewhere.'

Alexander (op. cit., p. 213. 16 ff.) takes τὰ μεταλλενόμενα in this passage as equivalent to 'metals and fossiles', and explains in accordance with the view he has already expressed that the former are composed of the moist exhalation (which is true) and the latter of the dry exhalation (which seems unlikely).<sup>1</sup> Alexander may perhaps have thought that τὰ μεταλλενόμενα here include the 'fossiles', just as they conceivably, but by no means certainly, include λίθος in 388<sup>a</sup>13 ff. But there is no reason to accept Alexander's interpretation, since the metals proper are in fact composed of both exhalations, the moist being combined with a proportion of the dry.

Our conclusion that the dry exhalation is the efficient, and not the material, cause of Aristotle's 'fossiles' seems to be corroborated by Theophrastus. In *De Lap.*, § 50 he discusses a group of mineral earths, of which three, namely ochre, ruddle, and realgar, are cited by Aristotle as 'fossiles'. In describing their origin Theophrastus states that 'some of them at least have obviously undergone exposure to fire (πεπυρωμένα) and some process of complete combustion, as, for example, realgar, orpiment and the like, but it may be stated generally that all are products of the dry and smoky exhalation' (πάντα δ' ὡς ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀναθυμιάσεως ταῦτα τῆς ξηρᾶς καὶ καπνώδους). The phrasing of the last sentence, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀναθυμιάσεως, at first sight suggests that the exhalation is conceived as the material cause of these earths. But if the statement is taken as a whole this interpretation is precluded. The argument runs: 'Some of these earths show clear evidence of having been burnt (cf. πεπυρωμένα with Aristotle's ἐκπυρούσα), but as a matter of fact all <have been exposed to fire since all> are products of the dry exhalation.' This makes sense only if the dry exhalation is the efficient cause in the formation of these earths. Moreover, had Theophrastus' opinion of the matter differed radically from Aristotle's, there can be little doubt that he would have drawn attention to the fact. This he is careful to do in dealing with another aspect of Aristotle's theory, namely, the suggestion that most of the 'fossiles' are coloured κοῖα. According to Theophrastus, only some of the coloured earths are composed of κοῖα; others are composed of sand, and others just of earth (*De Lap.*, § 40).

But even clearer support for our conclusion comes, surprisingly enough, from Georgius Agricola, the sixteenth-century mineralogist, who made determined efforts to interpret and correct the theories of Aristotle and Theophrastus in the light of his own practical knowledge. His verdict is: 'non videtur autem exhalatio sicca esse materia terrarum quae in venis et venulis gignuntur; sed potius ignita terras immutare atque eo modo novas species gignere potest.'<sup>2</sup> Agricola no doubt thought that he was correcting Aristotle; he would have been pleased to find that he was corroborating him.

D. E. EICHHOLZ.

UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL.

<sup>1</sup> Olympiodorus (op. cit., p. 314. 18 ff.) does not commit himself.

<sup>2</sup> Georgius Agricola, *De Re Metallica, libri xii*,

Basle, 1657; *De Ortu et Causis Subterraneorum*, iii, p. 508. Agricola lived 1490-1555.

Ἄλφει  
Andre  
Argo  
Aristo  
Bailey  
Barns  
1 ff.  
Beare  
Cicero  
Corint  
Delphi  
Dilke  
leid,  
Educat  
Eichh  
mine  
Fayam  
Galen's  
Glanv  
Greek  
Houra  
Repu  
Hudso  
moni  
Hudso  
65 ff.  
Isocrat  
Klos, I  
in W  
Ἀγκυθο

Aëtius:  
7 (C  
Alcidam  
de  
Alexand  
fr.  
Antholog  
3 (C  
12  
(C  
13  
Apollod  
Bib  
Apolloni  
2 (G  
Apolloni  
4 (S  
Aristaen  
1 (I  
Aristoph  
Eccle  
(1  
Frop  
The  
Aristotle  
Eth.  
(a  
Eth.  
(b  
(a  
53  
(b)

# INDEXES

## GENERAL INDEX

- Ἀλφειά, a note, 113 ff.  
**Andrewes, A.**, Corinthian Actaeon and Pheidon of Argos, 70 ff.  
 Aristotle's theory of metals and minerals, 141 ff.  
**Bailey, D. R. Shackleton**, Propertiana, 22 ff.  
**Barns, J. W. B.**, literary texts from the Fayûm, 1 ff.  
**Beare, W.**, slave costume in New Comedy, 30 f.  
 Cicero, *Ad Atticum* 4. 3, 9 ff.  
 Corinthian Actaeon and Pheidon of Argos, 70 ff.  
 Delphic oracles, notes on, 138 ff.  
**Dilke, O. A. W.**, Codex Etonensis of Statius' *Achilleid*, 45 f.  
 Education of the third class in Plato's *Republic*, 58 ff.  
**Eichholtz, D. E.**, Aristotle's theory of metals and minerals, 141 ff.  
 Fayûm, literary texts from, 1 ff.  
 Galen's moral philosophy, new light on, 82 ff.  
**Glanville, I. M.**, Tragic error, 47 ff.  
 Greek record-keeping and record-breaking, 105 ff.  
**Hourani, G. F.**, education of the third class in Plato's *Republic*, 58 ff.  
**Hudson-Williams, A.**, notes on Orientius' *Commonitorium* (I.), 130 ff.  
**Hudson-Williams, H. L.**, Isocrates and recitations, 65 ff.  
 Isocrates and recitations, 65 ff.  
**Klos, H. and L. Minio-Paluello**, text of the *Phaedo* in *W*, 126 ff.  
 Ἀγκυθος and *ampulla*, metaphorical sense of, 32 ff.  
**Manton, G. R.**, MS. tradition of Plutarch, *Moralia* 70-7, 97 ff.  
**Moritz, L. A.**, Ἀλφειά, a note, 113 ff.  
 Orientius' *Commonitorium*, notes on (I.), 130 ff.  
**Palmer, J. A. B.**, *Periplus Maris Erythraei*, ch. 47, 61 ff.  
**Parke, H. W. and Wormell, D. E. W.**, notes on Delphic oracles, 138 ff.  
*Periplus Maris Erythraei*, ch. 47, 61 ff.  
*Phaedo*, text of, in *W*, 126 ff.  
**Pickard-Cambridge, A. W.**, Italian vases and Attic drama, 57.  
 Plutarch, *Moralia* 70-7, MS. tradition of, 97 ff.  
 Propertiana, 22 ff.  
 Propertius—interpretations, 118 ff.  
**Quincey, J. H.**, Ἀγκυθος and *ampulla*, metaphorical sense of, 32 ff.  
 Slave costume, 30 f.  
**Smyth, W. R.**, *interpretationes Propertianae*, 118 ff.  
 Spartan Gymnopaediai, origin of, 79 ff.  
 Statius' *Achilleid*, Codex Etonensis of, 45 f.  
**Tod, M. N.**, Greek record-keeping and record-breaking, 105 ff.  
 Tragic error, 47 ff.  
 Vases, Italian, and Attic drama, 57.  
**Wade-Gery, H. T.**, origin of the Spartan Gymnopaediai, 79 ff.  
**Walzer, R.**, new light on Galen's moral philosophy, 82 ff.  
**Watt, W. S.**, Cicero, *Ad Atticum* 4. 3, 9 ff.

## INDEX LOCORUM

- Aëtius:**  
 7 (1), (22), 4; (24), 3.  
**Alcidamas:**  
*de Soph.* (31), 65, 68.  
**Alexander of Aetolia:**  
 fr. 3 (7-10), 71.  
**Anthologia Palatina:**  
 3 (28), 105.  
 12 (21 Simonides), 42; (92 Meleager), 122;  
 (212 Strato), 23.  
 13 (16), 107.  
**Apollodorus:**  
*Bibl.* 2 (8. 2), 2.  
**Apollonius:**  
 2 (947), 25.  
**Apollonius Rhodius:**  
 4 (59), 22.  
**Aristaenetus:**  
 1 (11), 122.  
**Aristophanes:**  
*Ecl.* (993-6), 39; (1072), (1098-101), (1101),  
 (1108-11), 40.  
*Frogs* (1202-4), 34; (1220-1), 41.  
*Thesm.* (936), 23.  
**Aristotle:**  
*Eth. Eud.* 1224 (b 21), 1225 (a 17), (a 20), (a 25),  
 (a 31), 48; 1226 (a 30), 53; 1246 (b 14), 48.  
*Eth. Nic.* 1100 (a 5), 52; 1110 (a 23), (a 26), 49;  
 (b 18), 51; 1111 (a 1), 1113 (b 24), 49; 1135  
 (a 28), 52; (a 32), 49; (b 16), 54; 1142 (a 21),  
 53; 1147 (b 6), 51; 1148 (a 3), 53; 1149 (b 4),  
 (b 27), 49.  
*Hist. Anim.* 588 (a 18), 90.  
*Meteor.* 358 (a 21), 142; 359 (b 10), 145; 378  
 (a 21), 143; (a 26), 141.  
*Poet.* 1449 (b 36), 51; 1452 (a 7), 54; (a 9), 55;  
 1453 (b 12), 56.  
*Pol.* 1310 (b 19), 75.  
*Probl.* 862 (b), 4; 919 (b 25), 53.  
*Rhet.* 1369 (b 5), 48; 1371 (b 10), 56; 1374 (b 7),  
 53; 1375 (a 6), 51; 1382 (a 21), 1385 (b 13),  
 1386 (a 34), 55.  
**Arnobius:**  
*Nat.* 7 (9), 136.  
**Athenaeus:**  
*Deipn.* 3 (98 c), 68.  
**Aulus Gellius:**  
*Noct. Att.* 15 (9. 10), 122.  
**Ausonius:**  
*Ep.* 31 (43), 27.  
**Catullus:**  
 10 (28), 118.  
**Chrysostom, Dio:**  
 31 (377), 106.  
**Chrysostom, Ioh.:**  
*In 1 Cor. Hom.* 28 (2) (Migne, *P.G.* lxi. 233), 7.  
**Cicero:**  
*ad Att.* 1 (14. 1), 12; 2 (15. 1), 19; (24. 4), 11; 4  
 (2. 5), 119; (2. 7), 20; (3), 9-21; (10. 2), 18;  
 9 (16. 1), 17; 13 (29. 1), 14 (2. 4), 28; 16 (2.2),  
 (7. 6), 18.  
*Balb.* (17), 19.  
*Clu.* (54), 122.



- Cicero (*cont.*)  
*de Fin.* 5 (39), 93.  
*de Off.* 1 (46), 92; 1 (110), 10; 2 (7), 123; 3 (100), 19.  
*Fam.* 8 (10. 1), 21; 9 (6. 2), 28.  
*Flacc.* (39), 11.  
*Mil.* (58), 11.  
*Pis.* (42), 124.  
*Prov. Cons.* (28), 18.  
*Verr.* 3 (19), 19; (70), 11.
- Claudian:  
 8 (558), 120.
- Cyril, St., of Alexandria:  
*Thesaurus* (Migne, *P.G.* lxxv. 77), 7.
- Diodorus Siculus:  
 17 (1), 140.
- Diogenes Laertius:  
 3 (81), 101.  
 7 (91), 95.
- Donatus:  
*de Com.* 7 (6), 30.
- Dracontius:  
*de Laud. dei* 2 (106), 132.  
*Orest.* (398), 136.
- Empedocles:  
 fr. 84 (Diels), 15.
- Ennius:  
*Trag.* (357), 120.
- Euripides:  
 fr. 481 (Nauck), 34.  
*Med.* (1339), 51.
- Eusebius:  
*Praep. Ev.* 5 (22. 214 a), 138; (25. 219 b), 139;  
 (29. 224 c), 138.
- Eustathius:  
 1885 (11), 113.
- Calen:  
*de Plac.* (4), 86.  
 (ed. Kühn) 6 (504), 115; (506), 114; 18 (151), 19  
 (76), 117.
- Gorgias:  
*Hel. Enc.* (19 Diels), 51.
- Hephaestion:  
*Ench.* (6), 33.
- Heraclitus:  
 fr. 119 (Diels), 91.
- Herodotus:  
 1 (25), 11; (85), 138; (200), 115.  
 5 (92), 138.  
 7 (133), 138; (220), 139.  
 8 (124), 9 (35), 110.
- Hesiod:  
*Op.* (289), 138.  
*Sc.* (243), 41.
- Hieronimus:  
*Epist.* 60 (14. 3), 131.
- Hippocrates:  
*Praec.* (12), 66.
- Homer:  
*Il.* 5 (786), 106.  
*Od.* 4 (611), 100; 12 (358), 20 (108), 114.
- Horace:  
*A.P.* (52-3), 44; (93-7), 32; (275), 134.  
*Epist.* 1 (3. 12-14), 32; (7. 65), 26; (16. 65), 137.  
*Sat.* 1 (4. 19-21), 43; (9. 36), 11.
- Isocrates:  
*Antid.* (1), 66.  
*Evag.* (74), 66-7.  
*Paneg.* (187), 69.  
*Phil.* (12), 69.
- Lactantius:  
*Epit.* 3 (1), 132; 40 (4), 135.
- Livy:  
 29 (34. 7), 122.
- Longus:  
 2 (7. 1), 120.
- Lucan:  
 5 (304), 43.
- Lucian:  
*Eun.* 11 (358), 122.
- Lucretius:  
 1 (271), 136.  
 5 (1199), 24.
- Lysias:  
 24 (9), 111.
- Manilius:  
 1 (774), 25.  
 2 (96), 27.  
 3 (382), 25.  
 4 (878), 28.  
 5 (19), 25; (475), 27.
- Martial:  
 9 (pr.), 28; (32. 1), 26.
- Menander:  
 fr. 302 (Kock), 44.
- Nicetas Eugenianus:  
 2 (120), 3 (220), 124.
- Orientius:  
*Comm.* 1 (3), (85), 131; (103), (115), (137), 132;  
 (247), (377), 133; (381), (437), (455), 134; (475),  
 (493), 135; (503), 133, 136; (527), 136; (591),  
 (593), 137; 2 (33), 134; (184), 130.
- Ovid:  
*Am.* 2 (11. 5), 120; (19. 36), 28.  
*Fast.* 3 (283), 24.  
*Her.* 1 (34), 25; 12 (187), 119.  
*Met.* 3 (45), 25; 13 (164), 22.  
*Trist.* 3 (8. 6), 120.
- Pausanias:  
 3 (7. 5), 81; (8. 1), 107.  
 6 (22. 2), 81.  
 10 (9. 2), 107.
- Pentadius:  
*Fort.* (31), 136.
- Periplus *M.E.*  
 (14), (31), 63; (47), 61-4; (51), 63.
- Persius:  
 5 (10-13), 43.
- Petronius:  
*Sat.* (134), 23.
- Pindar:  
*Pyth.* 1 (185), 123; 5 (60), (87), 140.
- Plato:  
*Hipp. Min.* 368 (c), 36.  
*Leg.* 963 (e), 87.  
*Lys.* 222 (b), 122.  
*Phaedo*, vv. 11, 126-9.  
*Rep.* 372 (b), 114; 414 (d), 60; 415 (c), 58;  
 456 (d), 460 (c), 59; 556 (d), 79.
- Plautus:  
*Amph.* (257), 24; (273), 25.  
*Bacch.* (446), 16.  
*Epid.* (650), 137.
- Pliny:  
*Ep.* 1 (2. 4), 38; 4 (30. 6), 36.
- Pliny:  
*N.H.* 19 (17), 16; 28 (25), 24; 34 (89), 123.
- Plutarch:  
*Alc.* (11), 108.  
*Mor.* 395 (A), 99; 402 (D), 404 (H), 100; 410 (A),  
 95; 585 (B), 598 (F), 100; 766 (D), 770 (D-E),  
 102; 785 (C), 101; 867 (C), 873 (B), 102; 998 (E),  
 55; 1073 (A), 103; 1086 (E), 35; 1108 (C), 103.  
*Pel.* (13), 101.  
*Theseus* (25), (30), 1.
- Propertius:  
 1 (1. 19), 22; (1. 33), 23; (2. 9), (2. 25), 118;  
 (3. 24), 23; (4. 9), 123; (6. 1), 119; (8. 23), 23;  
 (9. 16), (9. 20), 123; (9. 23), 119; (9. 31), 123;  
 (16. 43), 24; (18. 17), 121; (19. 1), 119.  
 2 (7. 9), 123; (8. 7), 121; (8. 9), (16. 53), 25;

Propertius (*cont.*)

- (18. 21), 121; (20. 11), 123; (21. 25), (23. 13),  
25; (27. 16), 123; (30. 7), 121; (34. 51), 26.  
3 (6. 27), 28; (7. 4), (8. 37), 123; (10. 11), 120;  
(18. 15), 123; (21. 25), 27; (23. 16), 28;  
(24. 13), 122.  
4 (1. 5), (5. 39), (57), (7. 25), 28; (11. 37), 29.

Prudentius:

- Psych.* (502), 134.

Quintilian:

- Decl.* 8 (pr.), 13 (3), 27.  
*Inst.* 1 (2. 28), 132.

Sedulius:

- Carm. Pasch.* 5 (97), 27.

Seneca:

- Contr.* 2 (5. 4), 23.  
*Ep.* 15 (8), 43; 87 (6), 18; 95 (65), 84.  
*Nat.* 3 (26. 2), 136.  
*Tro.* (959), 24.

Sophocles:

- Aias* (674), 26.  
*Trach.* (545), 51.

Sosiphanes:

- fr. 1 (Nauck), 23.

Statius:

- Ach.* (1), 45-6.  
*Silu.* 1 (3. 56), 2 (1. 226), 118; 3 (3. 50), 121.  
*Th.* 2 (183), 121; 10 (91), 120; 11 (112), 28.

Stobaeus:

- Ecl.* 1 (6, Diels), 54.

Strabo:

- 2 (3. 8), 96.  
8 (358), 73.

Suetonius:

- Aug.* (91), 23.  
*Calig.* (21), 135.  
*Iul.* 39 (4), 10.  
*Vitell.* (2), 24.

Terence:

- Andr.* (878), 122.

Tertullian:

- Apol.* (23), 22.  
*de Anim.* (10), 27; (57), 22.  
*de Pall.* (5), 26.

Theophrastus:

- de Lap.* (50), 146.

Thucydides:

- 1 (132. 2), 103.  
6 (16. 2), 108.  
8 (24. 5), 54.

Tibullus:

- 2 (4. 14), 23.

Virgil:

- Aen.* 6 (127), 132; 8 (23), 23.  
*Catalepton* 5 (1-2), 39.  
*Ecl.* 2 (26), 26.  
*G.* 3 (503), 122; 4 (251), 122; (484), 26.

Vitruvius:

- 4 (5. 2), 24.  
8 (4. 1), 25.

PRINTED IN  
GREAT BRITAIN  
AT THE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS  
OXFORD  
BY  
CHARLES BATEY  
PRINTER  
TO THE  
UNIVERSITY









## The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

V. B. PAGE, C.M., Litt.D.

E. CAPPE, PH.D., LL.D. W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D.

L. A. POST, M.A.

E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

Each volume Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 15s. net

A series of Greek and Latin Texts with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—*Times Literary Supplement*.

### NEW VOLUMES, 1949

#### LATIN

386 CICERO. DE INVENTIONE, TOPICA, DE OPTIMO GENERE ORATORUM. Translated by H. M. Hubbell.

381 LIVY. Fourteen volumes, vol. VIII, Books XXVIII-XXX. Translated by F. G. Moore.

387 PRUDENTIUS. Two volumes, vol. I. Translated by H. J. Thomson.

#### GREEK

383 ALCIPHON. AELIAN. PHILOSTRATUS. LETTERS. Translated by A. R. Benner and F. H. Fobes.

374 DEMOSTHENES. Seven volumes, vol. VII. Funeral Speech, Erotic Essay, Exordia, Letters. Translated by N. W. and N. J. De Witt.

382 SEXTUS EMPIRICUS. Four volumes, vol. IV. Translated by R. G. Bury.

**WILLIAM HEINEMANN, LTD.**

Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

### ARISTOTLE'S PRIOR AND POSTERIOR ANALYTICS

*Revised text with Introduction and Commentary* by SIR DAVID ROSS. 42s. net

Aristotle seems to have been more proud of having founded the science of logic than of any other of his achievements, and the *Analytics* contain the better part of his work in this field. It is 145 years since the last critical edition of the *Analytics* was published; the present work takes account of the studies published during that period, as well as of the work of the great Renaissance Aristotelians Zabarella and Pacius. In form it is on the same lines as the editor's editions of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* and *Physics*; it contains an introduction, the Greek text, a running analysis, a commentary, and Greek and English indexes.

Companion volumes by the same Editor:

ARISTOTLE'S METAPHYSICS. Two volumes. 48s. net

ARISTOTLE'S PHYSICS. 36s. net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

## HEFFER of CAMBRIDGE for CLASSICAL BOOKS

As of all subjects, we hold a very large stock of Greek and Latin Classics, both new and secondhand, and we will gladly answer all inquiries.

*Good prices are always given for standard editions of Classical Texts, and particularly for Dictionaries, Loeb Library, Cambridge Ancient History, &c.*

*The Bookshop known the world over*

**W. HEFFER & SONS, LTD.**

CAMBRIDGE



# Medieval Classics

*A series of literary and historical texts with translations*

*General Editors:* Professor V. H. GALBRAITH and Professor R. A. B. MYNORS

'Designed to make more generally known some of the greater writers of medieval Latin. There can be no question of the importance of this enterprise nor of its need. . . . The purpose of the new series is to produce good texts with, in each case, an English translation to face the Latin original page by page, and to supplement each volume with a strictly limited number of explanatory notes.' *Times Literary Supplement*

'This series promises to be not only of immense use to students but of interest and value alike to the general reader.' *Time and Tide*

## FIRST TITLE

### The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond

Edited by H. E. BUTLER M.A. (Oxon.)  
*formerly Professor of Latin, University of London*

'Professor Butler, working with sure linguistic and historical knowledge, has produced an edition which will supersede all that have gone before. The text is impeccable; the translation is fluent and accurate; and the notes which illuminate many of the more difficult passages may be especially commended for their brevity and restraint. It is in this volume that in future the fortunes of Abbot Samson will be read and enjoyed.' *Times Literary Supplement* 15s

*The prices of the other titles in the Medieval Classics will vary according to the length of each volume and will be announced nearer the date of publication*

### The Life of George Berkeley

PROFESSOR A. A. LUCE D.D. D.Litt.

'Berkeley, as man and Bishop, moves quietly through these pages with quite surprising vitality; and the various backgrounds, Irish, English, and American, are vividly reconstructed from the author's recent observation. . . . Dr. Luce has done a difficult job with grace and charm, concealing the very great labour and scholarship that have gone to the doing of it.' *Irish Times*

*Illustrated 25s*

'Dr. Luce's new life of the Bishop persuades the reader to fall in love once again and to be indulgent towards the philosopher out of affection for the man.' *Times Literary Supplement*

PARKSIDE **NELSON** EDINBURGH

JK

